LECTURES AND ADDRESSES

THE LITERARY REMAINS OF THE REV. SIMEON SINGER.

In Three Volumes.

SERMONS.

Selected and Edited with a Memoir by ISRAEL ABRAHAMS. With a Portrait after the Painting by S. J. SOLOMON, R.A.

LECTURES AND ADDRESSES.

Selected and Edited by ISRAEL ABRAHAMS.

SERMONS TO CHILDREN.

Selected and Edited by ISRAEL ABRAHAMS, with an Appreciation by the Honble. LILY H. MONTAGU.

Price 4s. 6d. net each.

THE LITERARY REMAINS OF THE REV. SIMEON SINGER

LECTURES AND ADDRESSES

Selected and Edited by
ISRAEL ABRAHAMS

LONDON
GEORGE ROUTLEDGE & SONS, LIMITED
NEW YORK: BLOCH PUBLISHING CO
1908

PREFACE

THE greater part of this volume consists of Lectures and Addresses delivered by Mr. Singer on various occasions. Some of his most popular efforts are omitted because the manuscripts were not in a condition for publication without considerable editing. This statement applies in particular to the lecture on the Jews of Rome, which was delivered in 1898 and repeated on at least twenty other occasions. Mr. Singer never used the same exact form twice. Hence the manuscript of this lecture is found in several versions, which will, perhaps, be collated and prepared for publication elsewhere. The lecture on Rome involved prolonged studies of sites, inscriptions, coins, and monuments in the Catacombs. Another lecture which has been omitted is "The Story of the Emancipation of the Jews in England." This was written in 1886, and was based on a careful study of the pamphlets and parliamentary records. Mr. Singer's interest in Anglo-Jewish History thus ante-dated the Albert Hall Exhibition. He retained that interest throughout his life. Further, a course of three lectures was delivered by Mr. Singer on "Jewish Life at the Dawn of the Christian Era," in December, 1900, and January and March, 1901. These, too, are held back for future publication. Finally when, in 1906, the University of

Cambridge selected the Eighteenth Century as the principal subject of study for its summer meeting, Mr. Singer was announced to lecture on "The Age of Luzzatto, Eybeschütz and Frank." He left many notes for this lecture, and these, too, may subsequently see the light. He felt a strong impulse towards vindicating his ancestor Eybeschütz against the strictures of Graetz.

Besides these and other addresses of a secular nature, Mr. Singer's sermons often took the shape of lectures, He gave long courses on the history of the Synagogue and of its Liturgy, on Hillel and Akiba, on many subjects of Biblical archaeology, and on literary anniversaries. Most Jewish preachers are in the habit of adopting this method, for the Synagogue is the place for instruction as well as for edification. Mr. Singer's course of lectures on Synagogue Decoration produced an immediate result. The new West End Synagogue was reconstructed internally through the generous response made by the congregation to their minister's appeal, and part of their memorial to him consists of the completion of the plans which he himself initiated.

Though it was with the utmost reluctance that Mr. Singer was ever induced to write an essay as such—almost invariably his literary work assumed the form of spoken addresses—he devoted several years to the production of a new English translation of the Daily Prayers. This book first appeared in 1890, and passed through many editions, the eighth being now in the press. The editor devoted much care to the Hebrew text, while the translation

itself is generally recognized as a fine performance. "Without disparagement of the labours of others" (wrote the *Jewish Chronicle*), "we are justified in asserting that Mr. Singer's is the first scholarly edition of the Prayer-Book that has seen the light of publication in England. The publication of the Authorized Daily Prayer-Book supplies a long-felt communal want in a manner that was confidently expected from a man of Mr. Singer's high reputation as a scholar and as a master of English style. The translation is accurate without being pedantic, while the language, graceful and melodious though it be, is equally simple and prayerful." As already mentioned in the Memoir, Mr. Singer left Historical Notes on the Prayer-Book which will be edited later on.

Mr. Singer's scholarship was shown in many other ways. His use of the Midrash in his sermons reveals a genuine love for the Rabbinic exegesis. His quotations were not made from books of reference, in fact his library was remarkably weak in such helps. He read the Midrash regularly and made his own citations. For many years he studied Talmud under private tutors after the traditional fashion. He lost no opportunity of adding to his knowledge. He was the first student to enrol himself a member of Professor Strong's class when the latter was elected to the Arabic chair at University College. He gratefully availed himself, too, of every chance of hearing Dr. Schechter's lectures on Rabbinic Theology and other subjects.

In 1896 he was associated with Dr. Schechter in a work dedicated to the teacher of both of them,

I. H. Weiss, of Vienna, on the occasion of the eightieth birthday of that famous scholar. The volume contained "Talmudic Fragments in the Bodleian Library," and was published by the Cambridge University Press. It includes, besides a fragment of the Palestinian Talmud, some pages from the Babylonian Talmud, Tractate *Kerithoth*, which are the oldest dated Talmudic MS. known. The colophon bears the date 1123. Another interesting feature of the text is the presence of accents, "probably intended to assist the student in the task of recital." For the Talmud, no less than the Bible, was intoned by its students.

With regard to the contents of the present volume, the addresses on "The Joy of Life," "Romance in the Midrash," "Jews and Coronations," and "Curiosities of Religious Controversy" were not prepared for publication by Mr. Singer himself. Hence there may be found an absence in these of the polished style which characterized the work which he himself saw through the press. A similar remark applies to many of the sermons. They would have read very differently had they received revision from the author's own hand.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
The Joy of Life	1
Romance in the Midrash	28
Is Salvation Possible after Death?	55
The Earliest Jewish Prayers for the English Sovereign	76
Adolph Jellinek	88
Early Translations and Translators of the Jewish Liturgy in England	94
Jews in their Relation to other Races	141
The Messianic Idea in Judaism	164
Where the Clergy Fail	203
Jews and Coronations	226
Some Curiosities of Religious Controversy	254
Isaac Hirsch Weiss	289

THE JOY OF LIFE

(*An Address delivered at the Summer Meeting of the Union of Jewish Literary Societies, in Ramsgate, August,* 1903.)

A FEW weeks ago a relative and friend—it is possible for one and the same person to be both—was busy arranging some of the details of these Ramsgate literary revels. He asked me to take a small share in the proceedings by reading a paper that might be suitable to the audience likely to assemble on this occasion. I was at the time in exceedingly bad humour, with a more than ordinarily pronounced disposition to take a gloomy view of things in general, and refused point blank; but, pressed again, I weakly yielded, a change which only served to aggravate my ill humour. Invited to choose a subject I answered in sheer perversity of mood and with as much of bitterness as I could throw into the words: "I will lecture on the Joy or Joys of Life."

To my dismay my interlocutor thought the subject excellent and appropriate, and before I realized where my attack of what our grandparents or great-great-grandparents used, I believe, to call the megrims or the vapours had led me, the fixture for to-day was made, and I found myself pledged to lecture to you on a subject chosen at the spur of the moment in a defiant spirit of contrariness.

I mention this detail of inner history by way of explanation and apology for much that is to follow.

But I cannot help thinking that unconscious "suggestion" also must have played a part in the choice of my subject. Ramsgate and the Joy of Life—how natural that the one should prompt the other. As long as I can remember myself the two have in my mind stood in a natural and logical relation to each other. If one cannot get an extra joy out of life here on this favoured part of the Kentish coast, where is one to find it?

There is a story told, I think, of Thackeray and some friends of his. They were speaking of a little, quiet, out-of-the-way, country place, and Thackeray, who knew the village, was asked whether there was any fun there. "Fun," said the novelist, "any amount of fun; only you have got to bring it with you."

Now, although of course it is well for every one who leaves the town for the country to bring his own stock of fun with him, there are few places more fitted than Ramsgate whether to supply a deficiency in the imports of the raw material of happiness, or, where these have been brought with the visitors, to make the most of an as yet untaxed article of the spiritual food of the people.

In a deeper sense, too, this Montefiore College where we are assembled must touch a lecturer's heart with happiness. The contemplation of a life, long in extent and intent, a life full of living, is the most effective means by which to convince oneself that life indeed has its joys. Sir Moses Montefiore was one of the great Jewish assets of the nineteenth century. This College, which perpetuates the names of his wife and of himself,

is an appropriate place then in which to discuss, in however light a spirit, the meaning of life and the true significance of its joys.

By way of introduction to the joys of life let me tell you a gloomy little tale.

It is a Persian parable, the moral of which is easy to see, though hard to digest. A traveller is leading a camel along the road, when suddenly the animal is seized with a fit of fury. To escape from it the traveller crawls into a well that happened to be by the way. Luckily he does not fall to the bottom, but in his descent grasps a bush which is growing out of a fissure in the stony lining of the well. As he looks up he sees the beast's head perilously near him ready to drag him back again; when he looks to the bottom he beholds a dragon, whose gaping jaws open to devour him. While he is desperately clinging to the bush he becomes aware of two mice, one white and the other black, creeping stealthily round the bush and each in turn gnawing at its root. Thus beleaguered, in fear and anguish, he gazes about him, when he espies some ripe berries growing temptingly on one of the twigs of the bush. He cannot resist the temptation. In his eagerness to secure and enjoy them he forgets all else—the camel's rage, the roaring of the hungry dragon beneath, the perilous progress of the busy mice; all dangers and terrors are ignored. His one and only desire is the enjoyment of a dainty mouthful.

You see the meaning of the parable. The traveller is "Everyman." The worries and perplexities of life —these are represented by the camel with his uncertain and capricious temper. Death is the dragon waiting for whom he may devour. Between the two, man, during

his life on earth, just manages to obtain a precarious lodgment. But day and night, the white mouse and the black mouse, are gnawing at the root of the branch to which he clings so tenaciously. And yet despite all these reasons why he should tremble and be in fear continually, his mind becomes oblivious of all such considerations, drawn only towards the ripe and delicious berries of pleasure which may be found even in this pit of gloom and anguish, the earth.

It is a very pretty and a very touching parable, not exactly cheering—just the sort of thing adapted to the taste of persons who like that sort of thing. For myself, if I were a preacher I should, I confess, never use it. Why? Because it embodies, along with a partial truth, what I believe is a great fallacy and in the mouths of most preachers, lay or professional, would sound a note of insincerity. If life be indeed in the main all that the gloomiest pessimist pretends, and if it offers us so little to rejoice in, that is not a reason for making the least of that little, but rather for making the most of it. If, on the one side, the cares of life threaten to rend us, and on the other, the coils of death to encompass us, how are we better prepared for either fate by refusing or despising such fruit and refreshment as our actual state affords?

It is quite true, there is not much necessity nowadays to tell people to enjoy themselves. The faculty of pleasure seeking is pretty general. But there is all the difference between regarding the enjoyment of life as a concession to the animal in man or as an acknowledgment of the human in him. Why should not joy itself be recognized as an agent in the moral evolution of man? It is very fine to tell people to be good and they will

be happy—it is no doubt true, and I am constantly recommending it myself; but sure am I that any one who really desires to make mankind better would do well to commence by trying first to make them happier. That is one of the great principles which the higher socialism of our age—the socialism that strives to put more sunshine into the gloomy lives of the masses—is often and splendidly putting to the proof.

Even the prophet, who at a period of decadence in Israel condemned his people because they said "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we must die," did not mean that the thought that death was coming to-morrow was a reason for starving ourselves to-day. This—"the most lurid and minatory of all Isaiah's prophecies"—is directed not against Israel's festivities but against Israel's insensibilities. The joy of the people was the sorrow of the prophet because the people were spiritually maimed, and he uses a popular proverb to express the frivolity of the revellers, as precarious as it was ill-timed. Isaiah in this sense only was a pessimist—he had a poor opinion of his contemporaries. But if ever there was a prophet of hope it was he. To him we owe the most cheering pictures of the Messianic age, with its idyllic happiness and universal peace; to him we owe the delightful image that men would one day "draw water in gladness from the wells of salvation." And so in the passage I have quoted (xxii. 13) Isaiah is not denouncing joyousness as something in itself objectionable. He does not design to kill joy, but to make it appropriate. When a national disgrace was over them, and a greater calamity imminent, it was no time for riotous merry-making.

And is there not also something self-deceiving and

misleading in representing, under whatever poetical figure, the joys of life as few and valueless ?

Honestly speaking, speaking from the point of view of any one who has a normally active liver, have we a right to complain of the lack of joys in our own life ? There are all the purely physical joys, for which, if they are ours—and who is devoid of them ?—we cannot be too thankful. This is too evident to need emphasizing. And there are other joys besides the purely physical joys, the value of which it is almost impossible to appraise. Given a fair average of health—and that I grant is a considerable admission—what pleasures may not be ours in the ordinary activities of life, in the sense of power they bring with them, in the actual achievement of any aim we deliberately set ourselves, in going about the world with our eyes and ears open to all it has to show and to tell us, in the satisfaction of the impulses of curiosity—curiosity which is, after all, the primitive parent of all knowledge—or in the higher intellectual satisfactions, the enjoyments now made accessible to us as they never were before, of nature, art and literature.

> Wings have we, and as far as we can go
> We may find pleasure : wilderness and wood,
> Blank ocean and mere sky, support that mood
> Which with the lofty sanctifies the low.
> Dreams, books are each a world and books, we know,
> Are a substantial world both pure and good :
> Round these, with tendrils strong as flesh and blood,
> Our pastime and our happiness will grow.

Let me dwell for a moment more particularly upon one of the joys here referred to by Wordsworth. Do we ever think how immensely the potentiality of

happiness is increased for every one who has the faculty and the taste, and cultivates them both, for reading. Compare the capacity for this pleasure, now the property of every, the poorest, child, with that which prevailed in days gone by, when ability to read was the distinction of the clerk or cleric, who, for reasons often unselfish enough, was not over anxious that others should share his power, or who took care that others, if they could read, should not read too freely or even too fluently. How dull and stale and unprofitable the lives of the masses must have been in those ages marked in history as "dark." And how have pleasures gained in quantity and in quality by the opening to all of the first gate to the accumulated treasures of recorded human experience and thought!

Visitors to Venice will remember Tintoretto's huge painting that covers one whole side of the Ducal Palace. It is a canvas crowded with figures, expressive of the most contrasted emotions. The bliss of the saved is depicted over against the looks and gestures of despair in the lost. Above stands the Virgin Mary, who is turning to her son with outstretched arms, and pointing to the crowds with tender motherhood. In the great eventful turmoil a man sits absorbed in a book, reading unmoved. The thirst for Heaven and fear of Hell are alike ignored. The man is reading—joy enough that to shut out all things else.

What fine teachers those old painters were!

It is often felt, and truly, that the concept good implies its opposite the concept evil—that you cannot have the sensation of joy without its correlative sorrow, that pleasure presupposes and is in that sense dependent upon pain. You have had for some cause or other to

put a great physical strain upon yourself, all your muscles have been under a mighty tension ; but your task is accomplished, and when rest comes you find that you can sleep with unwonted soundness.—" Sweet is the sleep of the labourer." Or some mental anxiety has oppressed you ; it is removed, and you know what it is to breathe freely. To appreciate riches truly one must have been poor. To value liberty one must have lived in slavery and oppression. How often has it been declared that no one knows how precious a boon health is, no one so rejoices and revels in it, as he who has made acquaintance with sickness and suffering.

> See the wretch who long has toss'd
> On the thorny bed of pain,
> At length repair his vigour lost,
> And breathe and walk again !
> The meanest flow'ret of the vale,
> The simplest note that swells the gale,
> The common sun, the air, the skies,
> To him are opening Paradise.
>
> (Gray)

Approach them in the right spirit and our very losses have in them a mysterious satisfaction. How else are we to account for it that so many people almost literally hug their sorrows ? The luxury of woe has a wonderful fascination for many of us. Nought so sweet as melancholy, is the refrain. It is true there are other voices, or shall we say other moods ? Who has not quoted in his time, " That a sorrow's crown of sorrow is remembering happier things," where our English poet does but re-echo the Italian's

> Nessun maggior dolore
> Che riordarsi del tempo felice
> Nella miseria.
>
> (*Inferno* v. 121).

There is no greater grief
Than to recall the happy time that was
In the wretchedness that is.

And yet when we think of it, is there not something imperishable in the experience we have once had of those happier things and happier times? In a sense death itself is the only thing that does not spell decay —it arrests decay. A beloved child dies, and death preserves it for ever as it was. Had it lived, the child would have merged in the youth or maiden, and these in the man or woman. But death has embalmed the child as a child in the memory of the survivors, and nothing but death could have done this.

Everything that we *have* changes; it is only what we have *had* that is unchangeable, irrevocably ours.

Not heaven itself upon the past has power;
What has been has been, and I have had my hour.

Happy he who can make the best use of his memories; who in his sorrow can recall past happiness without a sting, who in his joy can recall past misery without regret. The time may come, says Vergil, when the thought of former griefs will enhance present joy. May we not add, too, the hope that the time may come when the memory of former joys may mitigate present grief? Clearly it is a matter of moods and temperaments.

Though, however, our sorrows and our joys are closely intervoven, we must not leave out of consideration that host of satisfactions, which are not connected with, and owe nothing whatever to, any previous suffering. Where, for instance, is the pain and suffering necessarily preceding the agreeable sensations that are excited during a brisk walk on a fine morning? Has the pleasure we

derive from witnessing a heroic act, the emotion roused in us by a new triumph of science over nature, by the contemplation of some beautiful landscape, or beholding some noble work of art, has it necessarily drawn its sustenance from previous pain? And what of the many joys that have been ours but were totally unexpected? Some people think that the greatest, most abiding pleasures in life are those we have kept long in view, striven for and at length achieved. Is it so? If freshness is an element in enjoyment, it is the *unexpected* pleasures which furnish the keenest delight. I know a lady who avers that she never enjoys going to the theatre or the opera so much as when it comes to her as a surprise, when her husband is suddenly seized with an inspiration together with an unaccountable fit of liberality, say over dinner, and exclaims, Let us put everything aside and go to see so and so in such and such a piece; or—what is almost a greater gratification—when tickets of admission are sent by some friend, at all but the last moment, with the intimation that they must be used or will be wasted, and the recipients enjoy the pleasure of the unexpected, while at the same time they have the additional moral satisfaction of knowing that they have been instrumental in preventing waste.

This is a trivial example. But the trivial is often more effective than the weighty for bringing home a point. The light rapier can get home more easily than the heavy spear. We should all be happier if we cultivated an appreciation of the unexpected. It may even be said that you may judge people's characters by their faculty to enjoy on the spur of the moment. Many people turn angels from their doors, or greet them

with a cold welcome, because the angels come unawares. How different was our father Abraham! His angelic visitors reached his door without previous notice. Yet is he ready for them. Nay, his joy at receiving them, his hospitable enthusiasm, seem heightened by the fact that they were uninvited and unexpected. There are housewives, I fear, who are hardly so quick as was Sarah to smile upon guests suddenly introduced by their husbands. This enjoyment of the unexpected really amounts to sympathetic responsiveness. It is more than mere contentment. Contentment is perhaps a pallid virtue. What we need is not only acceptance of whatever comes but joyous acceptance. And we can cultivate this habit. Why should we so readily assume that only bad habits are easily acquired? Sir Walter Scott tells us of a rather morose individual who by assuming a bluff manner ended by becoming the most cheery of entertainers. Assume a virtue if you have it not—in order that you may have it.

To return to my point. There are innumerable cases of pleasure in which pain does not enter into the account in the least. What is true is that the element of desire is always present, even in the case of the unexpected pleasures—for then the latent desire is stirred into activity simultaneously with the opportunity of gratifying it. A healthy mind is always in a state of desire, conscious or subconscious. Destroy desire and you paralyse every attempt at progress; empty life of desire and you empty it of purpose. To apply great principles to little practices, it always seems to me a dubious recommendation when a thing is described in the tradesman's slang as "leaving nothing to be desired." There is a Continental hotel whose proprietor,

for the edification of his English customers, prints on his wine cards, "The wines of this establishment leave nothing to hope for." That is perfectly true, as those can testify who have tried them.

To give up all desire is to drain dry the fountain of the joys of life. If, as the pessimists assure us, desire means longing, and longing implies want, and want is pain, then we must put up with such pain, fortunate we in that we do not recognize it as pain. A life in which every desire were satisfied would mean death by the slow torture of ennui. When Prince Rasselas had been a little while in the happy valley he grew restive and was politely taken to task by his respected preceptor. "Look round," said the sage, "and tell me which of your wants are without supply; if you want nothing how are you unhappy?" "That I want nothing," replied the Prince, "or that I know not what I want is the cause of my complaint; if I had any known want, I should have a certain wish: that wish would excite endeavour, and I should not then repine to see the sun move so slowly towards the western mountain, or lament when the day breaks and sleep will no longer hide me from myself. . . . Possessing all that I can want, I find one day and one hour exactly like another, except that the latter is still more tedious than the former. . . . I have already enjoyed too much. Give me something to desire."

If these considerations are important from the point of view of our common humanity, they are still more so from the point of view of *Jewish* humanity. It is curious to note how rooted the idea has become in the world that Judaism is an enemy of joy. One has merely to use some such phrase as the "Levitical Sabbath,"

and forthwith in the minds of the majority who know us not, and are therefore less disturbed in forming a judgment of us, an image arises gloomy and morose, an image identified with the mental and moral features of the Jew. The thing has been refuted and disproved, disproved and refuted a hundred times, but still the legend lingers on. Even in writings of broad-minded and enlightened scholars the fallacy reappears with a quite amazing confidence. In an article by Dr. Francis Peabody, a Professor of Harvard University, printed in the *Hibbert Journal*, the character of Jesus is described as joyous, triumphant and with a delight in life in which the Talmudic teachers could find no satisfaction (Vol. I., p. 648, note). What an extraordinary, what an utterly unfounded assumption this is you will see in a moment. But the notion is so widespread that it is well to insist in explicit terms on the fact that the joy of life is to the Jew a real part of the whole religion of life.

What is calculated to fill one with profound wonder is the fact that the Hebrew Bible is so full to overflowing of the instinct of happiness. Whether and to what extent the writers held the doctrine of the soul's immortality, of a compensation in another life for the ills and disappointments of this, does not appear. The references to a future life are at the best few and obscure, and late in date ; certainly out of all proportion, whether to the magnitude of the subject or to other matters not of greater importance than this one.

Yet, despite the relatively narrow outlook of those old Hebrews, despite the apparent conviction that life is one and bounded by the grave, there is in them the spirit of joyous service, or of joyous resignation, or of joyous

trust. "Yea, though He slay me I will trust in Him," is perhaps the noblest utterance in all literature. The Jew is of course an optimist. He is, it must even be admitted, an incurable optimist. His optimism is the equipment with which Nature, or the Divinity behind Nature, has fitted him out from the time when he set forth upon his voyage through the ages. It has been his lifebelt, but for it he would have sunk long ago, overwhelmed by the billows of persecution which, seldom quiet and at rest, are soon whipped up again by the capricious blasts of prejudice or the furious tempests of racial and religious controversy.

So ingrained in the Jews is the joy of life that the arch priest of modern Pessimism, Schopenhauer, never could get over his aversion to them. Next to women he hated Jews most cordially. And in truth nowhere does a gloomy way of looking at life find less welcome than in Jewish philosophy. Did not the Bible teach the lesson clearly enough in its first chapter? Each day's work was pronounced "good," and the whole "very good." Not that there was any failure to recognize the solemnity of life. It was the artificial multiplication of means and occasions for giving it a deeper gloom, it was the spirit of morbid religiosity, that found no favour in Judaism. The Mosaic Jew recognized only one fast day, but many feast days and Sabbaths of joy. It is not only that we are exhorted to serve the Lord with gladness—gladness itself is a form of worship and divine service. "Because thou didst not serve the Lord with joy and with a cheerful heart out of the abundance of all things, therefore thou shalt serve thine enemy in hunger and thirst, in nakedness and in the lack of all things," said the Deuteronomist.

Much trouble the prophets and rabbis took to make clear that there was a better way of pleasing God than by mortification of the flesh. "Isaiah, while appealing for a broader charity and a deeper sense of justice, maintains that these and not fasting and self-humiliation are the true expression of a will sanctified unto God." (*Jewish Encyclopedia*, article "Asceticism"). "What sin," asks Rabbi Eleazar Hakkapper (Taanith 11a) "had the Nazirite committed that he was bidden to bring a sin offering? It was this, that he had vowed to deny himself the enjoyment of wine, though permitted by God. Consider then," continues the sage, "if the needless self-deprivation of one permitted enjoyment is regarded as a sin, what will be the state of those who deny themselves all the permitted pleasures of life?" The habitual faster, then, it is no wonder to hear stigmatized as a sinner, (*loc cit*). Rab (in T. Jer. end of Kiddushin) says: "On the day of reckoning man will have to give account for every good lawful thing which his eye beheld and which he did not enjoy." And what a world of meaning lies in the saying that the Shechinah—the divine spirit—descends and rests upon man not in the midst of sadness nor in the midst of slackness, but in the midst of gladness, of such gladness as flows from a good deed done.

There is a verse in Proverbs (xi. 17), which the A.V. translates, "The merciful man doeth good to his own soul, but he that is cruel troubleth his own flesh," which amounts more accurately to this, "A kindly man does himself good, a cruel man does himself harm." The writer evidently took a genial view of life and so among others does the religious philosopher Gersonides of the early fourteenth century, who in his commentary on

this passage speaks out boldly: "There are some people who imagine that by severely afflicting and mortifying themselves they are rendering a service to the Holy One, blessed be He; but, in truth, this is the very reverse of what God desires. That this is so can be seen from the fact that, with the exception of one ordinance on one day of the year, no precept of the Torah demands anything like self-affliction. The reason is that the mental and spiritual activities of man depend upon his physical faculties; if these are impaired it must react upon his higher powers. Any act therefore which enfeebles his body and which consequently tends to the enfeeblement of his soul, is in contravention of the Divine will and purpose."

One other citation let me give you, illustrative of the moral ideals of Judaism. There is a legend in the Talmud of the Prophet Elijah, who, having made one of his many reappearances on earth, accompanies a Rabbi into the market place, where in face of a vast crowd the Rabbi muses over the chances of Paradise for the multitude. The prophet points out a couple of men as assured of bliss in the life to come. The Rabbi inquires into their past life—What can they say for themselves? Only this—When we see any at strife we seek to make peace between them, and when we see any sad we try to bring joy and mirth into their lives. Surely it is a thoroughly Jewish sentiment to say, Blessed are the peacemakers and the joymakers, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.

The real problem which faces Religion—a problem which few religions have contrived to solve—is just this: how to hold the balance between smiles and tears. Excess of either is hysteria; a healthy modera-

tion in both is sanity. Judaism has perhaps been less called upon than other systems to define the religious function of suffering, because suffering has been the badge of all the tribe. Sorrow enough was there in the world without; it was incumbent to insist upon the joy within. Still asceticism has borne its share in Jewish life. Asceticism is an almost invariable concomitant of mysticism, and the Jewish mystics were undoubtedly ascetics. There is a large tract of Jewish life, that illumined by the career of Isaac Lurya, which is marked by a surrender of the world in pursuit of heaven. But here may be noted a characteristic difference. Lurya was at the very antipodes of gloom. Not only was he thoroughly happy in his mysticism and his self-denial, but he attached his inspiring ideas to the delights of religion. He it was who helped to make of the Jewish Sabbath the cheering bride, to idealize the home-life by the sacred joys of the observances and the ceremonial within the home. Or to put it otherwise, Judaism gave the world the figure of the "Suffering Servant"—Israel, whose mission to humanity was to be recompensed by inhumanity shown to the missionary. But Judaism did not rest in that figure as the perfect ideal. It was imperfect, it was incomplete. It was one aspect out of several, not the only aspect. Amid all his sorrows, Israel never for long felt himself unhappy. He saw the world with true vision: he did not allow his tears to blind him to the beauties of God's universe. He saw that it was very good, filled everywhere with the means to happiness. He heard the call of stern duty; he knew that when the young man rejoiced in his youth he would be brought into judgment. But these things made the Jew serious not sad; filled him with a con-

sciousness of the abiding purpose of life. And if these things made no pessimist of him, how should his own personal tribulations? He knew that he could hope. He did hope, and in the darkest hour he felt that he would soon be able to quote cheerfully :—

> Lo, the winter is past,
> The rain is over and gone;
> The flowers appear on the earth;
> The time of the singing of birds is come,
> And the voice of the turtle-dove is heard in our land;
> The fig tree ripeneth her green figs,
> And the vines are in blossom. (*Song of Songs*)

No, to the Jew the world was very good, full of the promise of happiness.

How is it then that, if there is such an abounding harvest of the joys of life waiting to be gathered, we carry comparatively so little away with us? It will be understood that it is far beyond my powers to give anything like an adequate answer to this question, for it would have to include a survey of the ills of life, real and solid enough, which must be deducted from the stores of happiness and in some cases leave very little balance on the happier side, and which would further have to include a consideration of all human limitations, physical, mental, and moral, the result, whether of inheritance, or of environment, or of an ill-trained and misdirected will—in short, an explanation of the existence of evil—a task to which one is only equal when one is very young. Nor in half an hour or so can we settle here, and I am sure we are not called on to settle, the old question whether it would on the whole have been better that man had not been created. That was a theme which, the Talmud tells us (Erabin 13 b) occupied the schools of Beth Shammai and Beth Hillel for two

and a half years. Beth Hillel took the view that it was better that man should have been created. Beth Shammai took the opposite side. Then when the debate had gone on long enough, they divided and on the votes being taken it was found the noes had it—the majority is not given. "Better that man had not been created," ran the verdict. But with their usual practical good sense they added the rider, "Now that he has been created he had better look to his actions." That is, speculation has proved unprofitable ; conduct is the main thing.

Let me rather glance for a few moments at one or two of those errors, dwelling in our own breast, and subject to our own control and correction, that are the cause of our so often going hungry in the midst of plenty.

In the first place, the error we commit is in supposing that happiness consists of an unbroken succession of exquisite delights. To indulge in such a notion of happiness is to invite disappointment. We sometimes overrate our own capacity for enjoyment with the result that we fail to obtain even the enjoyment which is well within our capacity. I remember once taking a country house, where my family and myself were to spend our vacation. The place had among other advantages a tennis lawn and a billiard table. One of my boys on discovering this ran up to me and said, "Now, father, this time we *shall* have a jolly holiday—a month of perfect bliss. We'll play tennis all day and billiards all night." But my young hedonist soon discovered his mistake, and found that the exclusive cult of tennis and billiards, even during our youth, is somewhat exhausting and finally unsatisfying, even as in adult years we have discovered that life isn't, and

it is as well that it shouldn't be, "all beer and skittles." Mr. James Sully in his *Pessimism* has a wise paragraph on the relativity of feeling. "What the law of the relativity of feeling requires, is that there should be constant change of mental state as a whole. It is possible to maintain for a long time a happy and even joyous frame of mind by a sufficient diversity of agreeable impressions and occupations. Well arranged transitions from one mode of feeling to another, as from active exertion to repose, and from social converse to solitude, are fitted to sustain a continuous flow of satisfaction" (p. 261). The remark commends itself as transparently just. The error we make in applying it is in supposing that any transition, even one represented, say, by exchanging tennis for billiards and billiards for tennis, will afford any very prolonged flow of satisfaction.

In the next place, what often diminishes from the sum total of our enjoyments is the habit of regulating them by others' standards. People are often made miserable, not because of what they have not got, but because of what other people *have*. They call it expanding their horizon. Is it not really contracting it? The habit is fruitful in mischief, especially, I fear, among our own community. The old Jewish ideal was a happy one, but it took more note of the *quality* of happiness, while we think more of the *quantity* of happiness. "A morsel of bread with salt shalt thou eat, and drink water by measure" if thou would'st enter the portals where the Torah dwells, and know the true happiness of life. *We* think only of *quantitative* tests of happiness. And so we can never be happy. For while the lack of quantity depresses, a sense of inferiority in quality

spurs, the *qualitative* test is no breach of the tenth commandment. To think that another has more than I have is demoralizing; to think he has *better* than I may be a real incentive to me to purge away the coarser elements from what I have. I err in thinking that he has *more* happiness; I do well to think his happiness purer than mine. But we make ourselves miserable as well as despicable when we count our possessions by the quantitative test of others' happiness. Here is an illustration of what I mean: Some time ago I called in the city upon a rich, a very rich, member of the Jewish race for assistance in a specifically Jewish cause. The gentleman was a man who, arriving from abroad perhaps a quarter of a century ago and beginning life in London on perhaps a pound a week, had grown or rather swollen into a millionaire. I should mention that his countenance had strongly-marked Semitic features of the type regarding which Heine says that it was designed by Providence so that God might know his deserters. He refused to support any Jewish cause. "I owe," said he, "to my Jewish blood all my troubles." "And," I replied, "all your successes." "It is a misfortune," he rejoined, "to be born a Jew." "How have you found it so?" I said. "You possess what is given to but few men, whether Jews or Christians, You have your town mansion near the Park, you have your country estate, you have your shooting and fishing in Scotland, you have a villa on the Riviera and your yacht in the Mediterranean, you have horses and carriages and motor cars. To have been born a Jew has proved no great calamity to you, that I can see." "So much you know of it," he exclaimed. "Let me tell you that I was proposed the other day as a member of the—let

me call it the High Life Club, and I was blackballed. Why? For no other reason than that I was born a Jew." "Granted," I replied. "But consider this. The world is divided into two classes of human beings—those who *are* members of the High Life Club, and those who are not. These latter are in a distinct majority. I would not think so ill of Providence as to suppose that happiness has been granted as the peculiar and exclusive prerogative of the members of the High Life Club." This gentleman was a sort of translated Hebrew Haman. He was miserable, because with all his glory one single club didn't bow down to him.

I tried to show him this. He could not answer my argument, and it remained unanswered; but so also, I am bound to say, did my appeal for help.

How people can allow their enjoyment of life to fall so completely under the domination of others is a puzzle to me, and I doubt not also to wiser persons than myself.

But there is another and deeper reason why happiness so often proves elusive. Sooner or later we discover that it is a vain theory to make pleasure or even happiness the great aim of our life. Happiness must be a by-product, not the staple industry. It is often an unexpected result, it must never be a primary motive. Other ideals when consciously striven for may be brought nearer to realization by the striving. But happiness? never. Happiness is far fleeter than any human pair of legs; it always keeps ahead of you when you pursue it. Yet it will of its own accord sometimes consent to pass a pleasant hour with you, if you do not thrust yourself on it when it will have none of you. Happiness chooses its own companions and its own times for receiving and communing with them. It will not

tolerate intrusion. You may be active in all else ; here you must be passive ; you *may* receive, you assuredly cannot take. And yet happiness consists in activity. That is the paradox.

I would have compared happiness just now to a fascinating maiden, except that the latter, though she often objects to pursuit, does not always resent it. But in another point the two evasive joys are alike. Both are pitiless against the scorner of their charms. If happiness must not be run after, it must be seized when it runs after you. If, says the Rabbi, you do not rejoice to-day when you have the chance and the opportunity, expect to weep to-morrow ! This is not quite the same as *carpe diem*, for the Rabbi's remark implies that happiness is not so much evanescent as occasional. Woe to those who have a blind eye to happiness ! When it does come, take it or you lose it, and may never find it again.

And so, again, some of those who miss the happiness provided for them belong to the class of sinners against the light, i.e. people who preferentially dwell upon all the darker aspects of things and shut their eyes to the brighter. Indeed, the deliberate cultivation of a spirit of sadness inevitably brings its penalty with it. Appropriately enough the penalty is a reflex of the sin. Dante and his guide, traversing the gloomy circle of the Inferno, come upon a stagnant, putrid pen, and there, buried in the black mud, they see the souls of the gloomy and the sluggish, who in expiation of their sin in life are ever forced to mutter :

> We were sad
> In the sweet air made gladsome by the sun,
> Now in this miry darkness are we sad.

A modern poet would express this thought otherwise, or, rather, he would choose another milieu, but the lesson he would point would be the same.

> If I have faltered more or less
> In my great task of happiness;
> If I have moved among my race,
> And shown no glorious morning face;
> If beams from happy human eyes
> Have moved me not; if morning skies,
> Books, and my food, and summer rain
> Knocked on my sullen heart in vain:
> Lord, Thy most pointed pleasure take,
> And stab my spirit broad-awake.
>
> STEVENSON, *The Celestial Surgeon.*

It is with happiness as with mustard—what we use is a small portion next to what we waste. But there is this difference—that somebody at least is the richer for the unused condiment—it is the manufacturer. The happiness missed is sheer, irretrievable loss all round.

What, then, are we to say of the people who take God's gifts in a temper, which is a perpetual reproach to the Giver, as though, whatever He did for them, He still owed them something?

"This is a reel splendid world," says Uncle Eben, a racy character, rich in the philosophy of inspired common sense, the creation of an American novelist, Irving Bacheller; "this is a reel splendid world. God's fixed it up so ev'rybody can hev a good time if they'll only hev it. Once I heard uv a poor man 'at hed a bushel o' corn give him. He looked up kind o' sad an' ast if they wouldn't please shell it. Then they tuk it away. God's gi'n us happiness in the ear, but He ain't agoin' t' shell it fer us."

The same sagacious counsellor has something to say

to the people who torture themselves in respect of perfectly innocent satisfactions, and imagine that whatever is new must be displeasing to God and is therefore to be avoided by man. Electric cars had recently been introduced into the township where Uncle Eb lived, and some of the people in his neighbourhood had misgivings about using them.

"Some says it's agin the Bible. If God had wanted men t' fly He'd gi'n 'em wings."

"S'pose if He'd ever wanted 'em t' skate, He'd hed 'em born with skates on," said Uncle Eb.

"Dunno," said the other; "it behooves us t' be careful. The Bible says, Go not after new things."

"My friend," said Uncle Eb, "I don't care what I rides in so long as 'taint a hearse. I wants sumthin' purty comfortable and middlin' spry. . . . Keep our jints limber. We'll live longer fer it, and thet'll please God, sure, coz I don't think He's hankerin' fer our society—not a bit. Don't make no diff'rence t' Him whather we ride in a spring waggon or on the cars, so long as we're right side up and movin'."

That is good philosophy.

It is, then, only in the activities of life that we must seek for the true and abiding happiness of life. Therein lies salvation from all outer troubles, sometimes even from ourselves. Surely no one does God's work so well as the joyous worker. "Thou meetest him who rejoiceth and worketh righteousness" (Isa. lxiv.).

> For still the Lord is Lord of might;
> In deeds, in deeds He takes delight;
> The plough, the spear, the laden barks,
> The field, the founded city, marks;
> He marks the smiler of the streets,
> The singer upon garden seats;

He sees the climber in the rocks;
To him the shepherd folds his flocks.
For those He loves that underprop
With daily virtues Heaven's top,
And bear the falling sky with ease,
Unfrowning Caryatides.
Those He approves that ply the trade,
That rock the child, that wed the maid,
That with weak virtues, weaker hands,
Sow gladness on the peopled lands,
And still with laughter, song and shout
Spin the great wheel of earth about.

R. L. STEVENSON, *Our Lady of the Snows.*

Let me conclude with a quotation from Chapter XXV. of George Borrow's *Lavengro*, published in 1851.

He is wandering along the heath till he comes to a place where, beside a thick furze, he sees a man sitting, his eyes fixed intently on the red ball of the setting sun. Borrow recognizes him as an old gipsy acquaintance, Jasper Petulengro, asks for news about the gipsy's family and learns that he had in the interval lost father and mother.

"What is your opinion of death, Mr. Petulengro?" said I, as I sat down beside him.

"My opinion of death, brother, is much the same as that in the old song of Pharaoh, which I have heard my grandam sing"—and then he gives a couple of Romany lines, "When a man dies, he is cast into the earth, and his wife and child sorrow over him. If he has neither wife nor child, then his father or mother, I suppose; and if he is quite alone in the world, why, then, he is cast into the earth, and there is an end of the matter."

"And do you think that is the end of a man?"

"There's an end of him, brother, more's the pity."

"Why do you say so?" "Life is sweet, brother."

"Do you think so?" "Think so! There's night and day, brother, both sweet things; sun, moon and stars, brother, all sweet things; there's likewise the wind on the heath. Life is very sweet, brother; who would wish to die?" "I would wish to die." "You talk like a gorgio—which is the same as talking like a fool; were you a Rommany chal you would talk wiser. Wish to die, indeed! A Rommany chal would wish to live for ever!" "In sickness, Jasper?" "There's the sun and stars, brother." "In blindness, Jasper?" "There's the wind on the heath, brother; if I could only feel that, I would gladly live for ever. Dosta, we'll now go to the tents and put on the gloves; and I'll try to make you feel what a sweet thing it is to be alive, brother."

This passage is referred to in Jane Helen Findlater's *Stones from a Glass House*, where she says: "You may search literature through for the like of this matchless dialogue, which in half a page sums up the character of both speakers—the anxious, foreboding, melancholy questioner, the merry answerer, with his pagan creed and *joie de vivre*." But I venture to think that we can have the *joie de vivre* without the pagan creed.

ROMANCE IN THE MIDRASH

(*Presidential Address at the Jews' College Literary Society, October 30th, 1904.*)

We commence to-day a series of addresses by various speakers on Romance in Jewish Literature. It was, I am sure you will admit, a happy thought to connect by some general unity of plan, the series of lectures to be delivered here during the present session. The subject, the syllabus and the lecturers—those of them that are to follow me—are such as should attract a good and appreciative audience. I cannot help expressing the earnest hope that the attendance both of members of the Society, and of others to whom we gladly offer literary hospitality, will not only be maintained but augmented in the course of the session. For although, to those who indulge the romantic sentiment, solitude is an advantage rather than otherwise, yet to a lecturer on the literature of the subject few things are more unsatisfying than to be left like—

> The Lady of the Mere
> Sole-sitting by the shores of old Romance.

The choice of the series is undoubtedly a happy one. The very word Romance sends a thrill through the most torpid veins. Nor need you hastily conclude that Jewish literature will prove a barren field in which to dig for gems of romantic beauty.

Romance plays a far larger part in that literature than the world, even the section of it which ought to know better, is apt to imagine. The place it occupies ought not indeed to surprise us. Literature cannot divorce itself from history, and is not the whole of Jewish history one in which the elements of wonder and mystery, the long expected and the unexpected, perils and deliverances, trials and triumphs, love and hate and all the primal passions unite ?

I do not know what exactly is expected of me in this Introductory address as President of the Society. But whatever it be I am sure to disappoint it. It struck me that instead of expatiating large o'er the whole scene of Jewish Romance, I should do better and might prove not more uninteresting if I confined myself to one corner of it, though it involves a little breach in the boundaries of the programme. To this I am tempted partly by the power that is vested in me as President a power which though not quite so far reaching as those of an irresponsible autocrat is yet extensive enough. You will remember that among the prerogatives of the sovereign according to the Mishnah, is the liberty to knock down anybody's party wall if the King wants access to his own proper royal field or vineyard, and none may let or hinder him ; that when there is spoil going, he not only is entitled to half of it, but he can make his choice of which half, and so forth. Now for the session I am king. But though I am strong, through the grace, the kindness and the loyalty of my colleagues, I am also merciful. I therefore propose to take away—with the consent or at least with the submission of the gentleman who is to follow me—one corner of his already too large domain, and to present, quite regardless of

chronological or any other propriety, some romantic elements in the Midrash. Like Heine's Jehudah ben Halevi we turn aside from matters of greater importance, and for refreshment we take refuge

> In the blossoming Agada
> Where are charming olden stories,
> Tales of angels, famous legends,
> Silent histories of martyrs,
> Festal songs, and words of wisdom,
> With hyperboles diverting,
> All, however, faith sustaining,
> Faith enkindling.

Indeed in regard to Midrashic literature from its earliest manifestations, which Zunz finds already in Chronicles and Daniel, to its latest development in the Middle Ages, the difficulty is not how to meet but how avoid meeting romantic elements. In every quarter an idealizing tendency was at work. Birth and death the beginning of all things and the end of all things, Paradise and Gehenna, every important event, every striking character in sacred history—over all is spread the glow of Romance.

But on one or two points we need to be put on our guard. We must not of course expect the long, set romances which we are accustomed to understand by that designation—the historical romance, the love romance, the romance of adventure and of chivalry, the pastoral, the rogue and vagabond and the robber romance, the political, the Utopian, the supernatural. But having said this, I feel almost impelled to retract it. Even the Arthurian legend, with its chivalrous settings, found its way into Hebrew lore in the thirteenth century ; some even think that the borrowing was the

other way. Long before that, Jewish literature in Greek was enriched by such romances as those of Asenath, in which both the love interest and the heroic is strong. Deeds of prowess are performed by the heads of the twelve tribes in some of these Greek and Aramaic romances which compare with the most approved feats of chivalry. Then, too, there is a Utopian romance curiously illustrated by the legends of the lost ten tribes, who are sometimes represented as dwelling under conditions of "virtuous and idyllic social life," such as cannot be otherwise described than as Utopian. But despite these and similar reservations I think that my generalization may stand, especially as I am specially speaking of the older Midrash.

Another thing that we must not expect, is to find in the romances of the Midrash anything like historical fidelity in details and accessories. That was a literary virtue not yet born. The great painters before or on the eve of the Renaissance equipped the ancient Jewish warriors in knightly lance and armour, and surrounded them with Italian scenery and mediæval architecture. A realistic, objective presentation of facts, such as is seen in a Holman Hunt or a Tissot, was unknown. Similarly the Rabbis of the Midrash gave to their characters the very form and presence of *their* time, not that of the time of the heroes and heroines they celebrated. Scenery, costume, manners, atmosphere, language, the very cast of thought and sentiments of the age of the Agadists, are made to harmonize with the age and characters they are depicting.

It would take us too far, and I should be, I fear, a very inefficient conductor on the journey, if we were to attempt to follow to their source the various streams

from which the romantic elements of the Midrash were drawn, or with which they were laterally connected. But no fact is more surely established by the modern science of folklore than that, in the use of the materials for romance, there has ever prevailed a spirit of literary communism, which recognizes no such thing as exclusive proprietary rights. The Agadists accordingly do not scruple to adopt suggestions and reproduce legends from the most unexpected sources; just as the Agada in its turn gave rise to many imitations. Such borrowed tales and ideas, however, invariably become modified in a more or less Jewish sense in the process of adoption, and reappear to inculcate some higher religious or ethical purpose such as they had never served before.

Take the beautiful legend of Moses going in search of the bones of Joseph when Israel is about to leave Egypt. Observe, says the Mechilta (and with slight variations the same story reappears in Talmud Sota 13a, Pesikta, and Debarim Rabba), the contrast between the piety of Moses and the self-seeking of the mass of the people. While they were only planning how they might load themselves with the spoil of their enemies, Moses was bent upon but one thing, how to keep faith with the dead, who had put his brethren upon oath that when they went forth to freedom his mortal remains should accompany them. But how did Moses know the burial-place of Joseph? It is said that Serach the daughter of Asher had alone survived of the contemporaries of Joseph, and that she informed Moses. "Here," said she, "the Egyptians laid him to rest; they placed his body in a metal sarcophagus, and sank it in the Nile." Thereupon Moses went to the banks of the Nile, threw a clod of earth into the stream, and cried aloud, "Joseph,

Joseph, the time has come for the fulfilment of God's promise to Abraham that he would deliver his offspring. Now give glory to the God of Israel, and delay not our redemption, for it is for thee that we tarry. If thou appearest not, we are free from the oath thou hast laid upon us." Forthwith the coffin of Joseph rose to the surface, and Moses took it under his care.

And be not surprised, the Midrash continues, at the heavy coffin rising at Moses' bidding. Did not Elisha make the lost iron axe rise from the water ? What was possible for Elisha, the servant of Elijah, is surely much more possible for Moses, Elijah's master. This act of loving piety on Moses' part was but measure for measure. When Jacob died, it was Joseph, chief at the time of his brethren, who made all the preparations for the reverent interment of his father. It is Moses, the chief of all Israel, who charges himself with the care of Joseph's remains. These were placed in an ark, and the Tables of Stone written with the finger of God were also deposited in an ark, the two travelling side by side. And men looked on with astonishment, and asked, What means this ark containing the word of the living God side by side with that holding the remains of a dead man ? Then would Moses answer, He that is laid in the one fulfilled what is written in the other.

Now, the first part of this striking passage is nothing else than an echo, and a very exact echo, of the myth of the Egyptian god Osiris. The identity of the two is pointed out, both by Jellinek (in Weiss' Mechilta, xxi.) and by Güdemann in his *Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*. Plutarch (in *De Isis et Osiride*) relates how Typhon induced his brother Osiris by guile to lay himself in a coffer, whereupon he nailed the coffer down, poured

molten lead upon it, and threw it into the Nile. Isis, the wife of Osiris, having heard of the crime, wanders through the land to discover the body of her husband; she learns from some children, to whom the Egyptians assigned the gift of prophecy, the direction which the coffer had taken, and she discovers it at last on the coast of Phoenicia, whither the waves had carried it. The similarity approximates to identity. Güdemann is of opinion that fusion is even more complete than appears on the surface. The Midrash is, he thinks, led to make a woman, Serach, the discoverer of the whereabouts of Joseph's coffin, because it is a female divinity who is concerned in the recovery of the body of Osiris. In one of the accounts Moses wanders for three days and nights vainly searching for Joseph's remains—an incident which recalls the wanderings of Isis bent on a similar quest. And there is even an association in the sound of the name Asher or Asser, the father of Serach, with that of Osiris in the Egyptian form Assar or Hesiri.

All this is very ingenious, though I fancy the learned doctor's ingenuity goes a little too far when he regards the naïve expression, "Be not surprised at the matter," be not surprised at a heavy coffin behaving in this light fashion, as an indication that the Agadists were uneasy, conscious of a certain incongruity in using pagan material for Jewish purposes; and to calm a not unnatural surprise, said, "Now do not be surprised, Elisha did something of the same sort." The spirit of romance, especially of Jewish romance, is synthetical, not analytical. The story was floating in the air, and it struck some one to utilize it for one of those myths that have a habit of growing up round the illustrious of long ago. The "Be not surprised, because something has happened

before equally surprising, which yet you will not deny," is a well-known device of writers with a turn for inventiveness; it is calculated to give an air of verisimilitude to their tale.

But the main thing is the high ethical purpose that informs the whole legend—how that faithfulness is more than riches; that the more unselfish the deed—and what can be more unselfish than the reverence we pay to the dead who cannot repay us—the more sure the recompense—a glorious paradox; and that death itself sets no term to the influence of the good life that has been lived.

Favourite topics of romance are clever cases for judges, rogue stories and biters bit.

Nowhere are the parallels more curious than in these romantic episodes. There is, for instance, the story told by Conon, contemporary of Caesar and Octavian. A Milesian hands over his money in charge to a money-changer in Teramene in Sicily. The money-changer, when applied to for the return of the deposit, refuses to comply with the demand. Summoned before the judge, he has recourse to this trick: He hollows out a stick, puts the money into it, and when about to take the oath, gives the plaintiff the stick to hold. He swears that he has returned the money. The lender, infuriated at this perjury, flings the stick to the ground, it breaks, and the money falls out.

Exactly the same story is told by the Midrash of the cheat Ben Talamyon. With a few minor changes, the same is related in the Talmud in a case where Raba, of the fourth century, acts as judge in Babylon. The story is told as a reason why, whenever witnesses come before the court, they have to be exhorted to the effect,

" Know that the oath we impose on you is to be taken, not in any sense you choose to give it, with mental reservation, but according to the thought of God and of the court of justice."

A curious thing is pointed out by Dr. P. F. Frankl, that in the thirteenth century the same story is told for the glory of St. Nicholas ; the deceiver is a Christian, the deceived a Jew ; but the end of the legend is that as it was owing to the wonder-working saint that the fraud was detected, the Jew becomes baptized and the saint and the Church are glorified. I need not remind you that this same tale occurs among the adventures of Sancho Panza. Parallels of this kind could be greatly increased were one to include in this summary survey the later mediaeval romances, especially such entertaining books as Joseph Zabara's *Book of Delight*.

It is an arresting thought that many of the stories, which were frankly droll, mischievous and sprite-like in their humour, are to be found in the Midrash on the Book of Echa or Lamentations, which we should expect to find filled with nought but melancholy matter.

Perhaps it is purposely designed : the gloom of the serious part of the work is all the deeper by reason of contrast with the humour of the other part. Or may there not be a good deal in the thesis about which old Robert Burton has something to say, Why witty people are mostly melancholy men ? Anyhow, there in Midrash Echa you have stories of the droll kind that passed into the literature of Arabs and Persians, thence into the Italian and other European literatures. There you have the tale of the one-eyed Jewish servant whom an Athenian bought in Jerusalem, and who could tell what sort of people formed a travelling company ;

of the mules ahead, and of one beast who was a she-camel blind in one eye, and of the burden on her back and so forth ; the original, in fact, of Voltaire's Zadig, and a far-off ancestor of our friend Sherlock Holmes. Again, we have tales like that of the man who, invited to partake of a meal at the house of a stranger, and urged to distribute the food himself, does so in this striking fashion. Five fowls have been provided for dinner. At the table sit host and hostess, two sons, two daughters, and the stranger. Then the visitor gives a fowl to the master and mistress of the house, another to the two sons, a third to the daughters, and keeps the other two for himself. He is challenged on the equity of the proceeding. Oh, says he, that is quite right : you two and one fowl equal three, etc. ; I and two fowls also equal three.

There, too, you can read of the man of Jerusalem who goes to an inn in Athens and asks for a night's lodging. The people eating and drinking say to him, No one is allowed to stay here, no one is free of the house, unless he can do three jumps. What jumps ? Show me, and I'll try to copy you. Then one of the company shows how it is done. With one spring he reaches the middle of the hall, with the next the door, and with the next he is outside the building. The Jerusalemite rushes forward and bars the door. By your life, he exclaims, as you meant to do to me I have done to you. All rather primitive, I fear, and not up to the standard of the new humour.

Drinking stories enter largely into the fabric of romances everywhere. The Jewish moralist, as was to be expected, was not behind others in his praise of sobriety and condemnation of drunkenness, and he

sought to gain access to men's hearts by arraying the truth in some romantic garb. Amidst much of weight which the Midrashim have to say on this subject, nothing perhaps is more telling than the story related, with slight variations, in the Midrash Tanchuma and Midrash Abchir concerning the planting of Lot's vineyard. While Noah was about to plant his vineyard, Satan suddenly appeared to him. "What is this thou art doing?" "I am planting a vineyard." "What good dost thou expect from it?" "Moist or dried its fruit is sweet, and from the juice thereof is made wine that rejoiceth the heart of man." "Come," said Satan, "let us be partners in this affair." "With pleasure," answered Noah. Thereupon Satan brought to the spot a lamb, a lion, a pig and an ape. He slew them one after the other by the side of the vine, and let the blood of these animals saturate its roots. And ever after the effect of this act has been traced in such as drink of the juice of the grape. If a man drinks a glass he is gentle, meek and mild like a lamb. If he drinks a couple of glasses he becomes rather leonine, with a tendency to be on the rampage, and to talk big, and say, "Who is my equal?" If he goes on drinking he becomes like a pig, wallowing in the mire. If he still continues, he is an ape, with nothing left him but a revolting semblance of the manhood he has himself degraded.

I rather like the part the devil plays here. No professional temperance orator could have done it better. Which is only another proof that the devil is not as black as he is painted.

But while the serious side of this great evil is mainly emphasized, the humorous side is also not overlooked.

In the following (Vayikra R. 12) one sees the humour and the oddity of the story, though it is not quite easy to read the moral. There was once a man who was a confirmed drunkard. To gratify his passion he sold bit by bit all the furniture and utensils in his house. His sons began to be alarmed. "If our father continues thus we shall not have a thing left in the place." So they adopted a drastic method to cure him. One day they plied him heavily with drink, and when he had become unconscious they carried him out and deposited him in a hollow or cave of the cemetery. "When he awakes," said they, "he will be greatly alarmed; he will not know how he got there, and in his terror he will repent of his evil ways and resolve to amend his life."

Now it happened that while the inveterate toper was lying there, a company of wine merchants passed that way, having with them asses laden with leather bottles full of wine for sale in the city. At that moment a riot broke out in the city, the noise of which reached them and filled them with such fear that they unloaded their asses, and deposited the wine at the very hollow in which the drunkard, unseen by them, lay asleep. Shortly afterwards he awoke, saw the glad vision of wine bottles all around him and quite near him, undid the mouth of one of the bottles, applied it to his own, drank its contents where he lay in perfect bliss, and fell asleep again. Meanwhile, the sons were growing curious to know what had happened, and repaired to the burial-ground; there they were astounded to behold their father bottle to mouth. "Here, too," they exclaimed, "Providence—the Providence that watches over drunkards—will not forsake thee. There is nothing for it

but that we should take our father to our homes, each of us (there were four of them) agreeing to provide him in turns with drink for a day."

The moral of this little drink story—which in its many features reappears in a good many places—is not very obvious. Perhaps, like many other romances, it was never intended to have a moral.

Sometimes we might almost be reading a passage from some old Miracle Play, machinery, characters, situation often lend themselves to the illusion.

Take a single illustration. For dramatic power, vivid and incisive dialogue, for the way of presenting the case of man distracted by a conflict of duties—that old yet ever new problem in life—it is doubtful whether any of the old moralities or miracle plays can compare with the development under the Midrash of the Abraham and Isaac legend.

Now there is no scriptural character, not excepting that of Moses, with which legend has been more busy than that of Abraham. A collection of all the stories and myths of which he is the centre and hero fills a respectable volume. Of these there is one group to which I would draw your attention. It has an interest and an instructiveness of its own. I refer to the part which is assigned to Satan in the life and trials of the patriarch. Gathering the statements on this subject, found in the Talmud, the Tanchuma, Yalkut, Tana debe Eliahu, Sepher Hayashar and Bereshith Rabbah and other Midrashim (Vayosha), they may be presented in the following consecutive form :—

On the day when Isaac was weaned Abraham gave a grand banquet, to which not only his own kinsmen, but all the neighbouring princes and nobles were invited.

While the feast was progressing, Satan, in the form of a decrepit man, presented himself at the patriarch's door to beg an alms from the richly furnished feast. He was refused, and Abraham and Sarah were too busily occupied with their exalted guests to notice what had happened. In that moment Satan found his occasion to accuse Abraham before the Lord of the universe. There came the day when the sons of God (angels) appeared before the Eternal; among them also the accusing spirit, called also Satan, the adversary, the hinderer, or Samael, he that blinds, because he blinds and misleads men. "Whence comest thou?" said God to him. "From going to and fro upon the earth and from walking up and down in it." "What hast thou to tell me of the doings of the sons of men?" "Verily, I have observed that the sons of men only pray to Thee and serve Thee so long as they want something from Thee. When their wants are satisfied, they forsake Thee and think of Thee no more. There is Abraham, the son of Terah, so long as he was childless he built Thee altars, worshipped Thee and proclaimed Thy name among all the inhabitants of the land. Now that Thou hast blessed him with offspring in his old age, he forsakes Thee. He prepared a feast for all the great ones of the earth, and to a poor and needy person who begged for a trifling gift he would give nought. Thee, O Lord, he forgot entirely, for he offered Thee not a single thank or burnt offering of all the cattle and fowl which he slew for Isaac's weaning festival. Where, indeed, are the altars he has since erected in Thy honour? He has even made a covenant with an idolatrous prince (Abimelech); he, the man whom Thou hast specially chosen." And the Lord answered him: "Hast thou

well considered My servant Abraham, that there is none like him in the earth, a perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God and escheweth evil? That feast he prepared only for his son's sake; but, as I live, were I to command him to offer up that very child as a burnt offering, he would not deny him to Me. That he has made a covenant with Abimelech was prompted by the desire to prepare a path of peace, that concord might prevail on the earth, and that he who is far off might be brought near to the upright and the just." "Well, then," replied the Satan, "do as Thou hast spoken; bid him offer up his son. See if he will fulfil Thy behest and not contend against it."

The command is given: Abraham sets out upon his journey towards Moriah with his son. On the road a man, bent double with age, meets him. It is the Satan. "Whither goest thou?" he asks. "To pray to the Lord." "What does he who goes forth to pray want with fire and knife and with wood upon his shoulders?" "Well, we may be delayed a day or two and require food to be got ready for us to eat." "Nay, thou deceivest me not, aged man. Was I not present when the Holy One bade thee take thy son as an offering? Ought an old man like thee to go and quench the life of a child given him when he had reached an hundred years. Thinkest thou another son will be granted thee? Believe it not, it is not the voice of God but of Satan that thou hast heard. Would God, who so loves thee, try thee so severely—thee, who hast taught the truth to many and strengthened the weak." But Abraham is unconvinced. "This is not piety," continues Satan, "it is folly. To-morrow He will charge thee with murder." But Abraham remains firm in his original purpose.

Foiled in his attempts upon the father, the adversary tries his arts with the son. He assumes the form of a youth and takes up his position at the right hand of Isaac. "Whither art thou bent?" "To study the law of God." "Indeed! When? while thou livest, or after thou art dead?" "Who can learn after his death?" he innocently replies. "Oh, miserable son of a miserable mother. How many a day did thy mother spend in fasting and in prayer before thou wast born? And now this old man, who has fallen into his dotage, is about to slay thee." "And yet I will follow him," said Isaac. "In vain then have been all the sufferings inflicted upon Ishmael that he might not be the heir." "I will not transgress the will of my Creator, nor the command of my father." But if the whole does not reach the half does. It is the peculiar character of slanderous speech that when the whole does not obtain admission to the mind a part does. And Isaac, not totally uninfluenced by what he had heard, exclaimed in a pitiful tone, "My father, my father," and related what had just passed. "Heed it not," answered Abraham. "These are but Satan's devices, to make thee waver in the fear of God." The adversary is not yet defeated however; all sorts of obstacles are placed in the way of the wanderers; a stream rises where there never was water before and reaches to their necks; but Abraham is convinced that it is but one of the delusions prepared by the Satan; and praying to God that he should remember how without fear and without delay he had fulfilled the divine command, and yet now when the end of duty seemed in view, the waters were flooding his soul, the danger vanishes, and they stand on dry ground. One final effort Satan makes. He

takes Abraham aside and whispers to him, "Thy purpose has come to nought. The news has been secretly brought to me that God will accept a ram and not thy son as an offering." But Abraham's answer is, "Such is the punishment of a liar, that even when he speaks the truth he is not believed." And freeing himself from the tempter he pursues his course.

Now what is the meaning of the whole of this remarkable series of legends? It is from first to last a fine psychological study. It depicts in living and moving forms the weakness and the strength of human nature; the convulsions of the heart in which the struggle between duty and desire is being fought out. With consummate skill and wonderful pathos, mingled with a vein of satire not necessarily inimical to the pathetic, the legend describes the doubts, hesitations, the plausible arguments that find entrance into the mind even of the best of men, when the task before them runs counter to their interests or affections, but is ordained by the voice of God within.

Rarely if ever have I been so impressed at a theatre as I was when I was present at a performance of *Everyman*. This Morality Play belongs to the end of the fifteenth century. The plot is simple. Everyman is summoned by Death, and seeks among his former comrades for a friend to join him on his long journey. First he appeals to Fellowship, then to Kindred, then Riches; but all fail him. "Good-deeds" alone is willing to come with him, but until Everyman does penance Good-deeds is too weak to walk. And while Beauty, Strength, Discretion, Five-Wits go with him to the grave's brink, there to leave him, Good-deeds abides with him in the tomb.

All earthly thing is but vanity:
Beauty, Strength, and Discretion, do man forsake,
Foolish friends and kinsmen, that fair spake,
All fleeth save Good-deeds, and that am I.

It is scarcely to be doubted that the dramatist derived his idea from the Midrash. Peter Dorland of Diest, the author, was a historian and theologian, and may well have read some Midrash. At all events, the parallel between *Everyman* and the following passage from the thirty-fourth chapter of the *Pirke de Rabbi Eleazar* (ninth century) is sufficiently close to make it probable that the plot of the former was borrowed from the latter. "Every man hath three friends in his lifetime; and these are they—his children and grandchildren, his money, and his good deeds. At the hour of his departure from the world he summons his children and household, and says to them: I entreat you, come and deliver me from the evil judgment of death. But they answer him, saying: Hast thou not heard that there is none that hath rule in the day of death? Is it not written: 'A man cannot redeem a brother,' nor can his money, which he loves, save him, for 'he cannot give unto God his ransom price.' But go thou in peace, they say to him, rest upon thy couch, and rise again to thine allotted place in the end of days, and may thy portion be with the saints of the earth. When he sees this he gathers unto him his money, and says to him: Much trouble did I take for thee day and night; I beg thee, ransom me from this death and deliver me. But money answers: Hast thou not heard 'Money will avail nought in the day of wrath.' Thereafter he bringeth in his Good-deeds, and he says to them: Come ye and deliver me from this death; be ye my support, and leave me not to

depart from the world, for I have hope of salvation in you. And they say unto him: Go in peace. Before thou art come thither we will be there before thee, as it is written, 'Thy righteousness shall go before thee, and the glory of the Lord will gather thee in.'"

No theme of romance has in the course of centuries had a wider circulation among the nations alike of the east and of the west than the myths that group themselves round the figure of Alexander the Great. The life and person of the great conqueror had every quality that appeals to the popular imagination. Accounts of his expedition into Asia, with all the wonders it revealed, are said to have been written by Callisthenes and others of his companions in arms, but these records, themselves it is believed sufficiently marvellous, have been lost, and a halo of myths has ever since encircled the head of the hero. The chief source for these is Pseudo-Callisthenes, who wrote his fabulous history in Alexandria at the commencement of the third century. The Alexander myths form material, not only for the Greek and Latin storytellers, but for Persian and Arab poets, and for the romance writers in nearly every European language during the middle ages.

To the Jews, Alexander the Great was a specially acceptable personality. During his invasion of Asia he had shown regard for their religious feelings, had spared the Temple every indignity, and had treated the people with great magnanimity. It is not surprising, therefore, that they also should draw him within the circle of Agadic Romance. While either utilizing Plutarch (in his *Life of Alexander*) and Pseudo-Callisthenes or drawing from the same sources as these writers, the Rabbis of the Talmud and Midrash here and there

moulded the material to their own conceptions. The temptation is very enticing to ask you to join Alexander the Great on his visit to Jerusalem and in his interview with the high priest, or to listen to his ten questions to the wise men of the south and to their answers, or to accompany him to darkest Africa, where there was a city of Amazons, who showed him the folly of fighting with them, and whom he left with the confession that he had been a fool, but that he had been taught wisdom by women. But I cannot touch on these, nor repeat the lesson he received in justice from King Kazia, who also lived beyond the dark mountains; nor the story of his ascent into the air, and his descent into the sea in a sort of diving bell; nor of his visit to the Gate of Paradise, and of what he there learned. All this would take an hour by itself, and is, moreover, the subject of a special lecture announced for next week.

The most frequently recurring mark in romantic literature is respect for womanhood. A lofty estimate of the character of woman, amid a certain cynical depreciation, runs through the Midrash. I think it is the case that those sections of Jewish folklore in which woman is held in low esteem are borrowed from India. In the purely Jewish romance the more ideal characterizations of woman recur constantly.

God endows woman at the creation with riper or more rapidly maturing intellectual gifts than man. At the giving of the Torah, it is the House, that is the women, of Jacob who are first addressed: "Thus shalt thou say to the House of Jacob and tell the sons of Israel," a hint of her due place and influence in the religious life.

But this point is so well known that I need not labour

it. What one must insist upon in this context is the great part played by the love motif in the Jewish romance. Chief among these romances is that of Akiba who, as a shepherd, marries the daughter of his wealthy master, then betakes himself to study, is supported by her in his student years, and ends by bringing honour upon her in his years of fame. Their love became a proverbial example of the devotion and happiness which came from marriage made in heaven. The Midrash lingers over the tale with obvious delight, and if I do not so linger it is because I take it that you already know and love the story well. Perhaps, however, a word or two more are needed on the point I dismissed just now.

The legal position of woman apart, there is traceable throughout the Midrash an appreciation of womanhood which if it does not lose itself in the clouds and has not much in common with the extravagance of chivalry, never sinks in the mire with other oriental romances, the Hitopadesa or such as the tales that form the staple of much of the post-classical romantic literature of Europe, like the Gesta Romanorum, and Contes and Gestes. One might even contrast the mediæval *Jewish* writers of fables, strongly influenced as they often were by non-Jewish models, with the Midrashic authors, very much to the advantage of the latter. Readers of the Mishle Sendebar, and the Jewish version of the fables of Bidpai, know how few of them are quotable before a mixed audience. One must admit that women are handled very roughly by these humorists. Their wickedness and deceitfulness are inexhaustible themes. The writers must have followed their models too slavishly or must have been very unfortunate in

their female acquaintances. Something also must perhaps be set down to the fact that women had not yet taken to writing romances themselves, or they might have given the other side of the picture, though it is by no means a dogmatic certainty, for when women authors do draw dark pictures of their sisters no mere male can compete with them.

Let us now turn to another specimen of love romance from the Midrash.

Solomon had sinned, was swallowed by Ashmedai, who then spat him out at a distance of 400 miles. Three years he remained in exile for his three sins. A wandering beggar, he exclaimed everywhere, "I, Solomon, was king in Jerusalem." He came to the capital of Ammon, stood idle in the market place, begging a piece of bread. The king's head cook came to purchase provisions, loaded his attendants with them and sent them back to the palace. On this occasion he had bought more than they could carry, and noticing Solomon among the beggars engaged him to carry the rest. Solomon asked to be employed in the royal kitchen, and to receive his daily bread for wage. Solomon gave the chef advice how to improve the cuisine, and the chef was so struck that he allowed him to prepare the special dishes for the king. The king noticed the change for the better, asked for the explanation, heard from the chef what had happened, sent for Solomon and gave him a life appointment as head cook to the court.

Now the king had an only daughter whose name was Naama, and (in regular romance fashion) chef and princess fell in love and became betrothed to each other. A few days afterwards a letter arrived from another

Court seeking an alliance by marriage with the family of the King of Ammon. The King of Ammon sent for his daughter and told her of the marriage he intended to agree to on her behalf. "My dear father," said the princess, "What do I care for wealth and station? the chief consideration is the *man* I am to marry: for me there is only one husband possible—it is the royal chef; his wisdom is great and he understands everything. In fact I am already engaged to him." When the king heard this he was so incensed that he would have put them both to death, but the queen interceded and dissuaded him from this extreme measure. However, the king turned them both out of the palace and drove them forth into the wilderness.

The twain now wandered together from place to place. They came to a river where they saw a man fishing. Solomon bought the fish, and on opening it found a ring in its inside with the name of God engraved on it, which confers upon its possessor miraculous powers. Solomon took the ring, placed it on his finger and immediately became another man. The spirit of God descended again upon him; he returned to Jerusalem, made himself known to the Sanhedrin, who restored him to his rightful place. Ashmedai, the demon, fled as soon as he caught sight of him. Solomon was king once more, and Naama became a good Jewess.

Now the King of Ammon was a vassal to Solomon, and, when things had settled down, Solomon wrote to the King of Ammon to request his and the queen's attendance at the court of Jerusalem. This request the King of Ammon saw no way of evading, and so he harnessed his chariot and with his consort paid a visit to his overlord. They were very cordially

received. They were entertained at a banquet, and the two kings made very merry. In the course of their conversation Solomon asked the King of Ammon why he had not brought with him his daughter Naama, of whose beauty Solomon had heard much. His guest told him what had happened. "But," said Solomon, "thou wast wrong in withholding thy consent, since the bridegroom was a very wise man, and thy daughter was very fond of him." At that point Solomon arose and went into another apartment. He and his queen then put on the garments they wore when they were driven forth from Ammon, and thus attired they reappeared before the king their visitor and his wife. These recognized the couple immediately, and wondered exceedingly how they had come there. It was only when Solomon again put on his royal apparel that they identified the king with the whilom head cook. The King of Ammon then fell at Solomon's feet and implored his forgiveness. But King Solomon raised the other gently and affectionately, showed him all honour and sent him away in peace and rejoicing.

But the love motif is by the Midrash employed for nobler purposes than this. No figure for representing the relations between God and Israel is more frequent in the Bible than that of wedlock. Here was a spring of romance practically inexhaustible. But the subject, which in later hands so often fell and dragged others into licentiousness, never sinks in the hands of the true Agadists. An unerring instinct of delicacy saves them, even though the standpoint be the ancient and oriental one which makes the wife the husband's subordinate.

Now she is the affianced, now the wedded wife. At

one time her heart is wrung in a very agony of remorse and contrition; at another she exults in a perfect ecstasy of bliss. Very bold, indeed, is the heroine of the following parable (Yalkut, Canticles 982).

A king, displeased with his wife, bids her leave his house, but she shall not be ungenerously treated. Whatever object is most precious in her estimation she is free to take with her from her husband's to her father's abode. Sorrowingly she submits to her hard fate—but what extremity can baffle the artifice of love? She gives a last sumptuous banquet to her lord, after which he falls asleep. Then she calls in her father's servants, and gently under her direction they lift and carry the sleeping monarch to the house of the queen's father. There he awakes. "What does it mean? How come I here?" "Didst thou not give me leave to carry with me what I hold dearest and most precious. I have thought and searched, but I have found nothing so dear and precious to me as thyself." So Israel in exile says, "Better to me is the law of Thy mouth than thousands of silver and gold. The Lord is the portion of mine inheritance. For Jacob hath chosen unto himself the Lord."

Not less exquisite is the picture drawn in the Midrash of Zion, once lone and expectant, again united to her Heavenly Spouse. It is (Canticles Rabba) founded on the words of Canticles i. 4, "We will be glad and rejoice in *Thee*." A queen is introduced whose husband and sons and sons-in-law go to a far-off land. Time passes, and tidings at length are brought to her, "Thy sons have come back." "Cause for joy will my daughters-in-law have." Next the news reaches her, "Thy sons-in-law are coming." "Cause for gladness will my

daughters have." At last the tidings are brought, "The king thy husband is coming." On which she exclaims, "This is indeed perfect joy, joy upon joy." So in the latter days will the prophets come and say to Jerusalem, "Thy sons shall come from afar" (Isa. lx. 4); and she will say, "What gladness is this to me?" "And thy daughters shall be nursed at thy side," and again she will say, "What gladness is this to me?" But when they say to her, "Behold, thy King cometh unto thee; he is just and victorious (Zech. ix. 9), then will Zion say, "This indeed is perfect joy," as it is written (Zech. ix. 9), Rejoice greatly,O daughter of Zion"—"Sing and rejoice, O daughter of Zion" (Zech. ii. 10). In that hour she will say (Is. lxi. 10) "I will greatly rejoice in the Lord, my soul shall be joyful in my God."

It is in scenes like these, in pictures of the days of the Messiah, of the glories and the happiness long postponed that yet must come—that the fancy of the Jewish romanticists revelled. Not the past but the future was for him the richest field. The best was yet to be. This it was that enabled the Jew always to keep heart of grace amid surroundings and conditions that would have crushed the life and spirit out of him. Romance for one so beset, all the ages through, was one of the very necessities of his being. Life had hardly been tolerable without it.

> Many a green isle needs must be
> In the deep wide sea of misery,
> Or the mariner, worn and wan,
> Never thus could voyage on—
> Day and night, and night and day,
> Drifting on his weary way,
> With the solid darkness black
> Closing round his vessel's track.
> (Shelley: *Lines written among the Euganean Hills*).

So too with the romance of the Midrash. Its poetry, its imaginative power, its ingenuity—great though all these were—signified less in the mind of the Jew than did its provision of an oasis in the desert of life, a promise of happier things soon to come. With almost magical touch it gilded the present with the near hues of the future. The glory of the approaching dawn tinged the last hours of the long night. It was this romantic strain in the Midrash that made its reader always so eager to believe that the long night was almost over. And to believe this is to remove the deepest gloom from the darkness.

And more. The ideal was there, but it did not produce, as the worship of the ideal often does, disgust with the real. The Jew was too sane for that: it made him fitter to face the real, to deal with it, to make the best of it—and so unconsciously perhaps, but not ineffectually, to bring it itself a stage nearer to the ideal.

IS SALVATION POSSIBLE AFTER DEATH ?

(*A contribution to a "Clerical Symposium" on the subject in the* Homiletical Magazine, *May*, 1885.)

Is salvation possible after death ? The question is framed with noteworthy caution. Answered in the affirmative, it ought to unite a large number and a great variety of minds, ranging from those who are conscious of a faint whispering of hope to those who have attained all but moral certitude in regard to this solemn subject. It is evident that to say that salvation is possible after death, is asserting far less on the affirmative side than the proposition that such salvation is impossible asserts on the negative. In the latter case you dogmatically announce a final closing of the door on the other side of the grave ; in the former, you do not proclaim the exact opposite ; you merely give expression to the belief that, under certain conditions, the gate of salvation may be opened even hereafter.

In the Old Testament the whole subject of the state of man hereafter is touched with so light a hand that we are conscious of space rather than form, and are roused to hopes and fears which can no more be defined than they can be localized. Certain it is that the few passages once held to be destructive of all future hope for the sinner are no longer believed to be burdened

with such a sense by many of the most competent exegetes. When Isaiah (xxxiii. 14) puts into the mouths of the sinners of Zion the words, "Who among us can dwell with the devouring fire? Who among us can dwell with perpetual burnings?" his intention is not to draw a harrowing picture of future torments, but to emphasize the idea that "only that which willingly yields itself to be God's organ can abide those flames —the fire of God's self-manifesting love and wrath" (see Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*). The material figures employed in Isaiah lxvi. 24 and Malachi iv. 1–3, seem almost intentionally designed to guard against that very error into which the popular interpretation has fallen. As to the "everlasting contempt" of Daniel xii. 2, it is certain that "olam" has there as elsewhere the sense not of an infinite but of an indefinite period—a view for which additional support may be derived by comparing "olam" of the second with "leolam vaed," "for ever and ever," of the third verse. Expressions like "that soul shall be cut off from its people," or, "I will destroy that soul *from the midst* of its people," imply a severance of the soul either in this life or in the next, or perhaps in both, from those with whom to be in communion is one of its chief joys; but they have no reference to the subject under discussion, and leave it quite unsettled. The more hopeful passages, and these are far more numerous, do also not deal directly with the matter in hand. From the mode in which they present the Deity to us, as a Being just in all His ways and gracious in all His works, they furnish us with grounds for inferring that salvation is possible after death: they do not authorize the belief in so many words. With what has been said under this head by

Prebendary Stanley Leathes, in the calm and thoughtful paper in which he has commenced this Symposium, I cordially agree.

At this point, however, I hold myself free to depart from the views of my predecessor. The very circumstance that the Old Testament speaks with no certain note on the subject leaves me, I conceive, at liberty to argue it on its own merits.

I. The ethical element underlying all penalties is that they shall be either deterrent or reformative. Punishment inflicted by a moral being is intended either to prevent others, by the example of suffering, from being guilty of similar wrong, or to hinder the offender from sinning again, and so to reform and improve him. Penalties in which neither of these motives operates are the result of vindictiveness. Now we cannot conceive God as punishing from this last motive. But if all potentiality of salvation disappears with death, that is, if the doom of the impenitent sinner is finally and irrevocably fixed at his death, then his sufferings can have neither a deterrent nor a reformative effect. They cannot have a deterrent effect upon other spirits—even supposing these to be conscious of the sinner's fate—because they are themselves, by the hypothesis, either among the finally saved or among the finally lost. They cannot have a reformative effect upon the sin-laden soul, because with the death of all its hopes of salvation die also all its motives for improvement. A terminable punishment, or even one gradually diminishing in intensity, so as ultimately to offer relative if not absolute happiness to the sinner, may be conceived as fulfilling this condition; and thus the possibility of salvation after death results from the

very purposes for which punishment is inflicted by a moral being.

II. From the point of view of all religion, the grand purpose of the creation of man is that he should work out the greatest attainable perfection of his own soul, and secure for it that condition hereafter which we call salvation. As a fact, there are none who are uniformly true to this aim throughout their earthly life. Sins, varying in number and in weight, burden the souls of all. Take now any one of the worst cases. On the supposition that God's displeasure entails for the sinner irrevocable forfeiture of all his prospects of salvation, the object for which God called man into being has been thwarted. God appoints man unto glory, and man, in the exercise of his corrupt will, renders the purpose of God impossible of achievement. What an awful power is that, which on such a theory is vested in every sinner. Not only can he accomplish the destruction of his own soul, or of his soul's eternal happiness, but also the defeat of the loftiest and most beneficent aims of the Deity. Terminable suffering, suffering proportioned to the guilt of the evil-doer, would not interfere with the ultimate achievement of the Divine plan. Rather must such punishment—if we conceive it not as vindictive but as vindicative, not as resentful but as reformative—aid in the final accomplishment of the great scheme of mercy. But deprivation of all hopes of reinstatement in God's favour; condemnation to a never-ending banishment; or—what would seem preferable to either—the complete annihilation of any one soul; negatives the possibility of the Divine plan being accomplished in regard to that soul. The theory denies, or at least, it does not concede to God in another

life that power He so often loves to exercise in this—the power of turning to good the evil thoughts and deeds of man. It makes man mightier for evil than God is for good.

III. Let us approach the question from another side, that of the moral constitution of man. Wherever we look, we perceive that "faults" break the golden continuity of the noblest lives, and that gems sparkle in the dry dust of the most degraded. The notion that all men can be divided into two distinct classes, with sharp lines of demarcation separating them, that they can be confidently labelled "black" and "white," is giving way to a more rational appreciation of human nature. There is in the members of the human family such a diversity of shading, so endless a variety of combinations of good and evil elements, that Omniscience alone can distinguish among them all. For such creatures as we are, what else can justice demand but a penalty in proportion to our misdeeds? As these vary in enormity and extent, so may the punishment vary in intensity and endurance. But the absolute reprobation of the worst sinner, his condemnation, that is, to undergo a penalty that shall have no end, is excluded by every notion we can form of the justice of God.

Prebendary Stanley Leathes argues:—If sin is a falling away from God, is it not conceivable that the longer the falling away is continued, the more hopeless it must become, and, if so, must not *perpetual alienation from God* involve the *perpetual inability of being reconciled* to Him? But here it is evident that "perpetual" is used in two senses that differ as widely as the span of human life differs from eternity. How are we to balance the one against the other? Even a life of unmitigated sin,

if such a thing were possible, seventy or eighty years of continued rebellion against God's will, would not be fairly met by an everlasting banishment from His love. No human life, no conceivable extent of time bears any proportion to eternity. But while such a case is purely suppositious, lives in which virtue and vice are mingled in endless complexity, are facts to which experience everywhere testifies. "Between the lowest saint who is saved, and the most amiable sinner who is lost, the difference must be very slight, yet the difference in their destinies is infinite." If there be such a consequence attached to sin as the forfeiture of all chance of salvation hereafter, have we not—we who by our very natures are never entirely free from sin, seeing that "there is no just man on earth who doeth only good and sinneth not"—have we not a right to know at what stage of evil-doing our condemnation passes from temporary and partial, to eternal and total loss of salvation; have we not a right to know this at least as clearly as we know what the offences are for which a human tribunal exchanges its milder penal inflictions for the irreversible penalty of death? Shall the Judge of all the earth not do justice? Shall He inflict a punishment which in regard to its chief issue, is absolutely indiscriminating and irreversible? If this were so, what a terrible fate would await the best of us in that death from which we cannot escape! What an unspeakable misfortune that life would be which was none of our seeking! It is well that such a gloomy doctrine should have the light of day cast upon it; for it is one which, in the pregnant words of a Jewish philosopher, "has rendered almost as many men practically wretched in this life, as it theoretically damns in the next" (Mendelssohn's *Jerusalem*, 106, ed. 1783).

What are the arguments by which these conclusions are met?

1. It is contended that we have no right to bind God with human cords; to assign to Him an ethical system which happens to be in vogue among mortals; to measure His standard of justice and mercy by our own. I reply that I have nothing else to guide me but the standard which reason, and the Scriptures interpreted by reason, afford. If I am not to hope for endless mercy as the ultimate fate of the sinner, because God's ways are not our ways,and His thoughts not our thoughts, may I not for precisely the same reason refuse to fear that endless misery will be the sinner's destiny? Why shall I assume that because in these transcendent matters God judges not as man judges, therefore His treatment of the sinner is more likely to be in the direction repudiated by my reason than in that which commends itself to the only faculty for measuring abstract right and wrong which God has Himself endowed me with?

2. The impenitent sinner deserves endless punishment, because he has consciously and deliberately rejected the endless mercy of God. The argument melts away beneath a single ray of common sense. How can a man reject "endless" mercy? If endless mercy be withdrawn from him in consequence of such rejection, it ceases to be "endless": it never was "endless." He has no more power to stop the flow of endless mercy than to stop the action of the law of gravity; he can no more withdraw himself from it, than he can withdraw himself from the universe. Try as he will he cannot reject it; it clasps him, though he tear himself from it; it discovers him, though he hide himself from it; it saves him, spite of himself.

3. The alienation of the soul from God implied by a life of unrepented sin, is a state in regard to which the only change antecedently probable is an aggravation of its worst characteristics. If a soul has continued through life in sin and quits it in sin, it has given itself an impetus that is only likely to increase in velocity as time passes into eternity, not to alter in direction. This difficulty is stated with much force at the conclusion of Dr. Leathes' paper. "Judging from the nature of the case, a state of alienation and departure from God is calculated to increase in intensity, rather than to alter in character. While obviously, if the nature becomes more and more confirmed, it must become less and less open to reformation." But is the inference drawn from these data unassailable? If repentance is possible at any stage of an iniquitous life; if, notwithstanding the accumulating obstacles to a return to God offered by endurance in sin, the recuperative powers of the soul do often triumphantly assert themselves; if, at the very time when vitality is ebbing away, it has been known to put forth its noblest efforts in a deathbed repentance, why are we to conclude that after death the soul in its essence undestroyed and indestructible, shall be able to exercise all its spiritual functions except that of repentance alone? As a believer in personal immortality, you admit that, after the death of the body, the soul is conscious, employs memory, is sensitive to spiritual pain and pleasure, can grieve and rejoice, can even feel regret and contrition. One thing alone it cannot do—it cannot repent. Its powers come to an end when it reaches the borderland between remorse and repentance!

4. Must not the moral effects springing from the

promulgation of a belief in the possibility of repentance and salvation after death be most pernicious? It gives an air of unreality to the most solemn exhortations of religion. The sinner will say, "The secret is out; I have another chance; it is indifferent where and when I repent." I confess I am unaffected by such imaginary alarms. For may not an objection of the same nature be urged against the doctrine of repentance in this life? If to hold out the prospect of repentance hereafter is a tampering with the duty of repentance here, then the admission of the efficacy of repentance here is a tampering with the gravity of sin itself. May not the sinner abuse his priceless privilege, and say, "Since the return is open to me at any moment of my life, for the present I will throw myself into the full stream of sin, and leave the backward journey to another time?" Yet all religions know how to meet such a perverse attitude of the mind, if it ever displays itself, and every one feels that there is nothing unreal in any religion which condemns sin, and at the same time preaches the saving power of repentance. The main thing is, after all, to keep alive the conviction that justice will be done to the worst as to the best. There is far more danger, I venture to submit, to the cause of true religion, in dogmatically maintaining a position against which our sense of justice, as God Himself has implanted it in us, revolts, than in clinging to the hope that, when the penalty has been paid, and the afflicted soul regrets its evil-doings, and yearns for reconciliation, the Lord will not cast it off for ever, because "though He cause grief, He will have compassion according to the multitude of His mercies."

Thus far I have been considering this question apart

from all special theological bias. It may, however, prove a not uninteresting contribution to the discussion to give a *résumé* of some of those rabbinical teachings which have helped to shape the belief now entertained by the bulk of my co-religionists. It must be admitted that the Rabbins, as a body, were not "universalists." Yet many and striking are the indications to be met with in the Talmud and Midrashim of a desire to soften the terrors of the popular conceptions concerning the Hereafter, and to breathe the spirit of hope into all who are destined to pass to judgment through the dark portals of the grave.[1] Apart from repentance the effect of which is irresistible even in *articulo mortis*, salvation after death is rendered possible by—

I. The sufferings of the sinner on earth.

II. His death.

III. The purging of his offences in Gehinnom, and the soul's unexhausted faculty of repentance.

IV. The prayers and pious works of survivors.

V. The intercession of beatified spirits, and

VI. The saving mercies of God.

1. The sight of all intense forms of human misery suggested the thought that for those who are so severely afflicted on earth, the end of life must be the beginning of bliss. It is in accordance with this idea that the Talmud (Erubin 41b) remarks that three misfortunes exempt men from the sight of Gehinnom, grinding poverty, certain forms of disease, and subjection to tyrannical rule. The judgment upon the generation

[1] Our acknowledgments are due to the Ven. Archdeacon Farrar for the valuable work he has done in the field of Rabbinic Eschatology, in his *Eternal Hope*, his *Mercy and Judgment* and in special articles on the subject.

of the Deluge lasted twelve months; they underwent their sentence, and have thus a share in the world to come (Bereshith Rabbah, chapter 28). If the loss of a tooth or an eye brought freedom to the slave, how much more so will afflictions that purge of sin the whole body of a man (Berachoth 5a). R. Simon ben Jochai said, "three great gifts the Holy One, blessed be He, gave to Israel and each of them, by means of affliction—the Law, the land of Israel, and the world to come" (Ibid.). R. Nehemiah said, "as sacrifices expiated for sins, so do afflictions" (see Lev. xxvi. 41). Nay, the latter are more efficacious than the former (Tanchuma on Jithro). "By means of suffering men pass to the life to come" (Bereshith Rabbah 9).

2. Death provided an atonement for sin. "All who die expiate their offences by death" (Sifre 33a). One who had been condemned to execution protested his innocence in this way: If I have done this deed for which I am now condemned, may my death be no atonement for all my sins; but if I am guiltless of this crime, then may my death be an atonement for all my sins (Sanhedrin 44b). The latter phrase seems indeed to have been a common formula (Berachoth 60a). The more aggravated the circumstances accompanying death, the more complete and certain was the expiation. Korah and his confederates, as well as Achan, have a share in the world to come (Bamidbar Rabbah 18, and Tanchuma on Vayesheb). R. Nathan said (Sanhedrin 47a), "It is a good sign when punishment comes upon a man in death itself: if he perish and none lament and none bury him; or if a wild beast tear him, or rain drop upon his bier—all this is a good sign for him"—"for thus atonement is obtained for him" (Rashi). Bereshith

Rabbah 65, relates how Jakim, a nephew of José of Zeredah, as a penalty for breaking the Sabbath, pronounced and carried out his own sentence of death; and how José beheld in a dream the coffin of his nephew hovering in the air, and exclaimed, "In an easy hour he has preceded me in finding entrance to the Garden of Eden." The legendary character of the narrative does not affect the belief of which it is a very striking expression. "Death the Liberator" was a conception not unfamiliar to the Jewish mind; but it there became a chief agent in man's spiritual discipline, and it was valued, not as the last refuge of physical or moral cowardice, but as one form of atonement for human sin, and a consequent deliverance from some of its most dreaded results. Bearing in mind the instinctive love of life in all men, and the unwillingness with which, as a rule, they part from it; the mysterious and unfathomable change wrought by death; the agonies that often accompany the severance of the life-long partnership between body and soul; the vast possibilities of suffering with which, unperceived by lookers-on, both memory and anticipation may afflict the departing soul; it was hard to believe that even for the sinner death was all loss, or, what is worse, only another stage forward to a state of misery, immeasurable in intensity and endless in time.

3. The doctrine generally prevalent in regard to the relation of this life to the next was that expressed in the words: "To-day is thine to do God's precepts, to-morrow to receive thy recompense for them." "This world is the vestibule, the next the banqueting chamber. Prepare thyself in the one, that thou mayest enter the other." But if this duty had been neglected, it was not

denied that the soul, after having acquiesced in the judgment pronounced upon it, and undergone its just penalty, might by the aid of contrition (which, with its other spiritual faculties, was indestructible), obtain restoration to the Divine favour. The idea of eternal punishment for temporary wrongdoing was repellent to the native sense of justice of the Jew. "The period of the judgment upon sinners in Gehinnom is twelve months" (Adoyoth ii. 10). In Erubin 19a, one view is expressed to the effect that transgressors can repent at the gates of Gehinnom. In the Othioth, or Alphabet of R. Akiba (Oth Cheth), we read: The sins of the wicked of Israel are accounted to them as righteousness when they look upon the face of Gehinnom and submit themselves to its judgment. And when they are rescued thence and return repentant to the Holy One, blessed be He, they are forthwith received by the Shechinah even as the just who have not sinned, as it is written (Ezek. xxxiii. 19): "When the wicked turns from his wickedness and does that which is lawful and right, he shall live *with them*" (the preposition *'al* is here used, which has sometimes the force of "together with," or "in addition to," as in Gen. xxviii. 9 and Exod xxxv. 22), that is, he shall live with the righteous and the perfect, the men of faith and good works in the world to come. And not this alone; but such penitents shall be uplifted and seated near the Shechinah, because they have humbled their heart in contrition before Him, as it is said, "The Lord is near to the broken-hearted."

For the sake of one ardent "Amen," streaming from the soul of the sinners in Gehinnom, they shall be delivered from their agonies. When the voice of Zerubbabel shall sound throughout the world in sanctification of the

Divine name, the sinners of Israel remaining in Gehinnom shall respond "Amen," and confess the justice of their fate. Instantly the mercies of the Holy One, blessed be He, will be moved towards them exceedingly, and He will say, "Why should I punish them still more, it was 'the evil inclination' that caused them to sin" (Yalkut on Isa. xxvi., Eliahu Zutta xx.).

"God saw all that He had made, and behold it was very good"—that is both Paradise and Gehinnom (Midrash Koheleth). As the praises of God rise from the just in the Garden of Eden, so also do they rise from the wicked from Gehinnom. The sinners cool Gehinnom with their flowing tears (Shemoth Rabbah 7). Why did God create Paradise and Gehinnom? That the one might deliver from the other. What is the space between them? R. Jochanan says, it is but the width of a wall; another, that of a span. Others, two fingers' breadth (Midrash Koheleth on vii. 14). It was under such figures as these that the Rabbins taught that it was not an impossible thing to pass from a state of reprobation to a state of bliss; that as the spirit still lived, divorced from the body that bound it to earth and earthly frailties, it might continue, in its disencumbered state, to perfect its way; that the idea of future punishment, most consonant to the character of God and the wants of man, was that of a state which led through great but limited suffering to ultimate and unending blessedness; and that there was no place where God holds sway which could have borne such an inscription as that over Dante's Inferno—"All hope abandon, ye who enter here."[1]

[1] The punishment of "Careth" excision, says Abarbanel (Commentary to Numbers, section Shelach), may include a

4. The prayers and pious works of survivors are capable of affording relief to the departed soul in its state of punishment. The remarkable passage in 2 Macc. xii. is a testimony to the antiquity of this belief and the fervour of conviction with which it was held. The same conviction is implied by the recital of the Kaddish by orphans. It underlies also the "Hazcaroth Neshamoth," or Souls' Memorial Service, in which entreaty is made that God may in His mercy remember the souls of departed kindred and friends, that they may be bound up in the bond of life and their rest may be glorious, while the supplicant himself gives proof of his sincerity by acts of practical beneficence. Study of the Law has likewise a redemptive force. (Zohar to Lech Lecha. See Nishmath Chayim ii. 27.) "It is written, 'Pardon Thy people Israel, whom Thou hast redeemed' (Deut. xxi. 8). The first sentence speaks of the living, the second of the dead. The living can

physical and a spiritual penalty—a physical in this world, in that the life of the sinner is prematurely cut short; a spiritual in the life hereafter, in that the soul after its separation from the body will be kept at a distance from the brightness of the Shechinah, and from those higher influences which are enjoyed by the spirits that merit to partake of the bond of life. This punishment is called "a cutting off," a metaphorical expression implying that just as a branch is cut from a tree from which, while attached to it, it derives vitality and sustenance, so will the soul be cut off from the bond of celestial life, and not receive the Divine glory—the true spiritual bliss and recompense. But this does not constitute a total deprivation or absolute loss for the soul, which, being a spiritual self-existent substance, is indestructible. "Careth" is a great pain and punishment for the soul, of which it will receive more or less (according to its deserts), and after having undergone its penalty it will inherit Paradise and bliss. "There is hope of a tree, if it be *cut down*, that it will sprout again, and that the tender branch thereof will not cease."

redeem the dead. Hence we are accustomed to make mention of the dead on the Day of Atonement, and to appoint a sum to be given in alms on their behalf. For thus have we learnt in Torath Cohanim, that even after death charity availeth as a means of redemption. The troubled soul is then raised from its suffering, swiftly as an arrow is shot from the bow; it is cleansed as on the day of its birth. It partakes henceforward continually of the tree of life, planted in the region of the righteous; itself becomes righteous and lives for ever." (Tanchuma to Haazinu.)

The passionate yearning to save those whom we have loved and lost is not without its effect, teaches the Talmud. Those whose own merits are too weak to plead for them are sometimes saved by the intercession or for the sake of others more worthy than themselves. Thus the renegade Elisha ben Abuyah, "The Faust of the Talmud," is saved from perdition by his pupil R. Meir (Jerus. Chagiga 5b); Antoninus Pius by R. Jehudah the Holy (Abodah Zarah 10b); the executioner of R. Chananyah ben Teradyon by the martyr himself (Abodah Zarah 18a); and a captain of Turnus Rufus by R. Gamliel (Taanith 29a). (See notes of Schlessinger on Ikkarim, p. 679.) Upon the pathetic words uttered by David when he hears of the death of Absalom, the Talmud (Sotah 10b) comments: "Eight times is the cry repeated, 'My son.' The rebellious child of David had been cast into the lowest of the seven grades of Gehinnom. But with each invocation the broken-hearted father lifted him a stage out of his misery, and with the last drew him into heaven."

I am aware that in many quarters strong objections are entertained against "prayers for the dead." (1) It

is felt that to pray for the suspension or mitigation of the penalties of the soul that has gone to its account, is to challenge the Divine sentence and to seek to interfere with the course of Divine justice. I answer that the same objection may be raised against all entreaties as well as against other more direct personal efforts to lessen the sufferings of sinners on earth, when their punishment has been the just recompense for their misdeeds. All prayer, in so far as it is specific, looks for some response in the natural sense of the petition, although it is true that response may also be given in a higher sense, by an inflow of spiritual strength and comfort. If God was not displeased with the patriarch who wrestled in prayer for the sinners of Sodom, nor with the "man of God," who pleaded for pardon for his erring people, if these efforts involved no improper intervention with the progress of God's just decree, it is difficult to see why there should be anything contrary to the Divine desire or outside the proper scope of human entreaty, in prayer on behalf of the soul awaiting or already enduring its merited punishment.

Against the practice of praying for the departed, it is contended—(2) That it is useless, because their earthly life having come to a close, nothing that the survivors can say or do will affect them. I reply, what right have we thus to limit the power of prayer? If there be any efficacy at all in words poured from the full human heart into the listening ear of God, shall we say that it has vanished when the object of our prayer is nearer to God than ever before, when the spirit has returned to Him who gave it? All our best prayers are for others, not for ourselves. Can we feel that

prayer is of avail when offered for the sick child, for the dying parent, for the life of the sovereign and her counsellors, for those that are in peril on land and sea, even for the soul of some beloved being, beset by temptations in its earthly career,—but that for the soul that has quitted its temporal abode, perhaps called suddenly hence, never, even after the longest and loudest warnings, fully prepared—for *it* all our prayers are vain and self-deceiving ? Unless we are prepared to maintain that at his death the fate of man is fixed irretrievably and for ever ; that therefore the sinner who rejected much of God's love during a brief lifetime has lost all of it eternally, prayer for the peace and salvation of the departed soul commends itself as one of the highest religious obligations.

5. That the bliss of the just in heaven must be overshadowed by the consciousness of the sufferings being endured in hell, is a thought that occurs to every mind which has formed a lofty ideal of happiness. What joy can heavenly spirits feel while they are aware that those who once were bound to them by the tenderest ties of love or the strongest bonds of friendship, with whom to be reunited is the all but universal hope of believers in immortality, are condemned to have the gates of hope for ever shut against them, and to pass eternity in nameless torture and remorse ? There, where all hate is extinct, can there be any satisfaction in the unending torments of evildoers ? Can there be any perfect peace above while there is infinite despair below ? Must not the knowledge of the agonies endured without prospect of cessation by even one of their own species, quench every spark of joy in the assemblage of the blessed, and impel them with one accord to petition

the God of mercy in language like that of the inspired lawgiver: "And now if Thou wilt forgive their sin—but if not, blot me out, I beseech Thee, from the book which Thou hast written!"

It is said in Midrash Koheleth, that in the fulness of time many parents and children will be found, reaping the reward of their actions, these among the righteous, those among transgressors. At the sight of the wretchedness of their parents, the children will burst into tears, and will implore the Almighty Judge, "Restore our parents to us." And the Holy One will answer, "Your parents have sinned and deserve not to join you." And the children will reply, "If we have merited the compassion of God, let our parents be given us again." Then Elijah the prophet will arise, and plead their cause saying, "Here are the guilty, and there the innocent. May mercy prevail over wrath." And the Lord will turn to the children and say, "You have spoken well for your parents; they shall be restored to you."

6. But far more effectual than all these agencies is the boundless compassion of the Most High, who "retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy," who, though He forsake the sinful for a brief moment, gathereth them again in great compassion. In Sabbath (89b) occurs this beautiful passage. Quoting the words of Isaiah (lxiii. 16), "Surely Thou art our Father: though Abraham will not know us, and Israel will not recognize us, Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer from Eternity is Thy name"; the passage continues: "In the future life, when God sits in judgment upon His creatures, He will turn to Abraham and say, 'Thy children have sinned.' And

Abraham mournfully assenting will answer, 'They must be blotted out, for the sanctification of Thy name.' So too will Israel answer. But Isaac intercedes on their behalf, and the sinners of Israel look up to him and say, "Surely thou art our father,' then he, directing them to the Holy One, blessed be He, says to them, 'Praise Him, not me; He is your Father.' And raising their eyes on high, with one voice they exclaim, 'Yea, though Abraham will not know us, and Israel will not recognize us, Thou, O Lord, art our Father, our Redeemer from Eternity is Thy name. Whom have we left but Thee?'" "When God hears them pleading thus, He replies (Ibid.), 'Since it is upon My mercy you throw yourselves, behold, though your sins be as scarlet they shall be as white as snow, though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.'"

One other illustration may be given of the breadth of view and the tenderness of spirit manifested by many of the Rabbins in the treatment of this difficult subject. It is found, with slight variations, in Shemoth Rabbah 25, in Tanchuma and in Yalkut. At the hour when Moses stood before God on the mount, the Holy One, blessed be He, showed him all the treasures of recompense prepared for the righteous. Looking at one, Moses said, "Whose treasure is this?" "It is for them that study the Law." "And this?" "For them that lead a just life." "And this other?" "For them that adopt the orphan." So he questioned and was answered regarding every store. Then beholding one larger far than the rest, he inquired, "For whom is this designed?" And the Lord answered him, "he that hath merits of his own, to him will I give of his own recompense. And he that hath none, with him I

will deal mercifully for nought, and give him of this treasure. I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious (not only to him to whom recompense is due) and I will be merciful to whom I will be merciful."

THE EARLIEST JEWISH PRAYERS FOR THE ENGLISH SOVEREIGN

(Read before the Jewish Historical Society of England on the Accession of Edward VII.)

THE paper I am about to read is intended as an instalment of a fuller one, in which I hope to treat of the Synagogue in its relation to the Sovereign and the State. Scattered about in various libraries, hidden away in many out-of-the-way places, there is a considerable amount of material—poems, hymns, and prayers, sermons and addresses, in Hebrew, in Spanish, in Judæo-German, and in English, prompted by occasions of special interest in the history of our country, and of its rulers and their families, and forming a very respectable body of evidence testifying to the loyalty of English Jews. A complete bibliography of these productions remains, despite the publications of the Anglo-Jewish Exhibition, a desideratum. Whether I shall be fortunate enough to present such a record to the Jewish Historical Society of England will depend upon the kindness and public spirit of those who may be in possession of the requisite material.

I do not know whether the dish, when duly prepared, will prove altogether palatable to the cultivated tastes of members of this Society. In view of the fact of the

accession of a new monarch, it may at least lay claim to being seasonable.

There is a tradition in Megillath Taanith that when Alexander the Great, instigated by the Samaritans, the ancient rivals and enemies of the Jews, set out with the object of destroying the temple, Simon the Just went to meet the conqueror, and endeavoured to divert him from his purpose, urging, among other reasons, the following: "This is the place where we pray to God for the welfare of yourself and of your kingdom, that it may not be destroyed; shall these men, then, persuade you to destroy this place?" That it was the practice, when Jews assembled for worship, to pray also for the safety and welfare of the Ruler and State, is proved by a whole host of witnesses, such as Ezra, the authors of the Book of Baruch and of the first Maccabees, Philo, Josephus, and others. The famous exhortation of Jeremiah, "Seek the peace of the city, whither I have caused you to be carried captive, and pray for it unto the Lord, for in the peace thereof shall ye have peace," was at all times and in all places at once the sanction and the stimulus for such prayers. I doubt not it was effective also among the Jews of England in pre-expulsion times. It is true that in the Anglo-Jewish Liturgy of that age, as preserved in the Prayer-Book of R. Jacob, of London, and summarized by the late Dr. D. Kaufmann in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* (Vol. IV.), there is no set form given of a Prayer for the King; but it is hardly conceivable that the Jews, who were eager to show their loyalty at the coronation of Richard I by the presentation of costly gifts, for which they got little thanks and much mauling, would have neglected one of their chief religious duties within

the Synagogue itself. When Abudarham produced his work on the Jewish Liturgy (fourteenth century) the particular place in the Service where the Prayer for the King was to be introduced was already fixed. "After the Reading of the Law has been completed," he says, "it is the custom to ask for a blessing on the King, and to pray to God to help and strengthen him against his enemies." Thereupon he quotes Jeremiah, and explains that to "pray for the peace of the city" is "to pray that God may enable the King to vanquish his enemies." Then follow Talmudic authorities in support of the custom of praying for the powers that be.

After the expulsion, the only Jewish prayers regarding the Kings of England were probably to the effect that Heaven might open their eyes to the folly of keeping out such desirable citizens and subjects as the Jews. We know how long it took before that wish was realized.

The earliest recorded instance of Prayer being publicly offered up on behalf of the Royal House of England occurred under sufficiently remarkable circumstances. During the troubles of Charles I with the Parliament, his Queen Henrietta Maria repaired to the Continent to quicken interest in her husband's cause, and to induce sympathy to take, if possible, a practical form. While on this errand she spent some time in Holland, and visited the Amsterdam Synagogue, and there, after a Prayer for the rulers of the Netherlands, she heard her own Royal House prayed for. This was in 1642. A few years later, in 1651, the St. John Embassy, despatched in the interests of the Commonwealth, also paid a visit to the Synagogue, and there, as Menasseh ben Israel states in his *Vindiciæ Judæorum* (p. 5), "our nation entertained him with musick, and all expressions of

joy and gladnesse, and also pronounced a blessing not onely upon his honour, then present, but upon the whole Commonwealth of England, for that they were a people in league and amity."

But already, before the date of the St. John Embassy, there occurs in a book printed in London the earliest reference in the English language to the Prayer for the Sovereign. This is in Edmund Chilmead's English Translation of Leon Modena's *The History of the Rites, Customs, and Manner of Life of the Present Jews throughout the World* (London, 1650). After describing the Lesson from the Prophets, which, it is said, " is read by some child, for the most part, to exercise him in reading the Scriptures," the author continues (p. 115) : " After this, they take the said book, and, holding it on high that it may be seen by all, they bless all the assistants. Then is there a solemn Benediction said for the Prince of the State under which they live ; wherein they pray to God that He would preserve him in Peace and Quietnesse, and that He would prosper him and make him great and powerful, and that He would also make him favourable and kind to their nation ; observing to do this from that passage in Jerem. Chap. xxix. ver. 7," etc.

By this time we find Menasseh ben Israel (may his memory be a blessing) busy with his great scheme, as may be seen from the introduction prefixed to the *Hope of Israel*, and addressed to the Parliament, the Supreme Court of England, and to the Right Honourable the Council of State in 1651. In 1655 was issued " The Humble Addresses " of Menasseh " To His Highnesse the Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland," giving the motives of his coming to England, and showing, first, " How Profitable the

Nation of the Iewes are," and next, " How faithfull the Nation of the Iewes are."

Here for the first time appears in full an English version—and a capital one it is—of the Prayer for the Head of the State. The translation is prefaced by these words :—

" From the continuall and never broken custome of the Iews wheresoever they are, on the Sabbath Day, or other solemn Feasts ; at which time all the Iews from all places come together to the Synagogue, after the benediction of the Holy Law, before the Minister of the Synagogue blesseth the people of the Iews ; with a loud voice he blesseth the Prince of the country under whom they live, that all the Iews may hear it, and say, Amen.

" The words he useth are these as in the printed book of the Iews may be seen :

" He that giveth salvation unto Kings, and dominion unto Lords, He that delivered his servant David from the sword of the enemy, He that made a way in the sea, and a path in the strange (? strong) waters, blesse and keep, preserve and rescue, exalt and magnify, and lift up higher and higher, our Lord. [And then he names, the Pope, the Emperour, the King, Duke, or any other Prince under whom the Iews live, and adds :] The King of kings defend him in His mercy, making him joyfull, and free him from all dangers and distresse. The King of kings, for His goodness sake, raise up and exalt his planetary star, and multiply his dayes over his Kingdome. The King of kings for His mercies sake, put into his heart, and into the heart of his Counsellers, and those that attend and administer to him, that he may shew mercy unto us, and unto all the people of Israel. In his dayes and in our dayes, let Judah be safe,

and Israel dwell securely, and let the Redeemer come to Israel, and so may it please God.—Amen."

This was the Prayer which Pepys heard, in Hebrew, of course, in the Synagogue, probably in Creechurch Lane, on the occasion of his visit, described in a passage in his diary (October 13, 1663), when he formed a very unfavourable opinion of Synagogue decorum. "And in the end they had a prayer for the King, in which they pronounced his name in Portugall; but the prayer, like the rest, in Hebrew."

But in addition to this translation of the traditional form, still preserved in the main by Jews of both the Sephardic and Ashkenazic rite, Menasseh has left another and a very touching prayer for the Protector, with which he ends his *Vindiciæ Judæorum*. We can almost picture him to ourselves, sitting in his study in the Strand, not many hundred yards from the place where we are gathered this evening, and as he nears the completion of his noble Vindication on April 10, 1656, writing the last lines in the form of this fervent prayer:—

"Now, O most high God, to Thee I make my prayer, even to Thee, the God of our fathers. Thou who hast been pleased to stile Thyself the Keeper of Israel; Thou who hast graciously promised by Thy holy prophet Jeremiah (cap. 31), that Thou wilt not cast off all the seed of Israel, for all the evill that they have done; Thou who by so many stupendious miracles didst bring Thy people out of Egypt, the land of bondage, and didst lead them into the Holy Land, graciously cause Thy holy influence to descend down into the mind of the Prince (who for no private interest, or respect at all, but onely out of commiseration for our affliction, hath inclined himself to

protect and shelter us, for which extraordinary humanity, neither I myself nor my nation, can ever expect to be able to render him answerable, and sufficient thanks), and also into the minds of his most illustrious and prudent Council, that they may determine that, which according to Thine infinite wisdome may be best and most expedient for us. For men (O Lord) see that which is present, but Thou in Thy omnisciencie, seest that which is afarre off."

The first English prayer for an English King appears in a somewhat curious connexion. Jacob Jehudah Leon (Templo),[1] born in the seventeenth century, was a man of versatile talents. He was a scholar and a theologian, as well as an artist and designer. He had made a special study of the Tabernacle and Temple, and had constructed a model on an ample scale of Solomon's Temple with all its furniture and utensils, according to the details given of the sacred edifice in the Bible and the Talmud. A short description, explaining the subject, was published by him in pamphlet form. Templo's work (the cognomen Templo explains itself) made a considerable sensation at the time, and not in Holland only, where the Government gave him a guarantee against piracy, but wherever interest was taken in Biblical antiquarian studies. Some time before 1645 the model was submitted to Henrietta Maria, the wife of Charles I, and seems to have elicited her warm admiration—she probably saw it during her visit to the Continent to which I have already referred. Many years later, in 1665, after the restoration, Templo

[1] Comp. Graetz, X. pp. 200, 201 ; and Lucien Wolf, "Anglo-Jewish Coats of Arms," *Transactions Jewish Hist. Soc. of Eng.* II. pp. 156, 157.

bethought him of submitting his model to her son, Charles II, and drew up a description in English, furnishing it with a "Dedication to His Sacred Majesty" in the eulogistic style of the period.

The pamphlet, entitled *A Relation of the most memorable things in the Tabernacle of Moses and the Temple of Salomon*, by Jacob Jehudah Leon, Hebrew author of the *Model of Salomon's Temple*, bears the Royal Arms and initials, and was printed at Amsterdam by Peter Messchaert, in the Stoof-Steech, 1665. On the back of the title page, and before the Dedication, may be read :—

"A PRAYER.

"FOR THE PROSPERITIE OF HIS ROYAL MAJESTIE.

"He that sends deliverance to Kings, and giveth Dominion to Princes, whose Kingdom and Dominion is everlasting : He that delivered David his servant from the Perillous sword, and He who made a way through the Red Sea, and Pathes through the River Jordan : He himself blesse, preserve, assist, make great, and more and more Exalt our Gracious Lord CHARLES the II King and Protector of England, Scotland, France and Ireland. The King of Kings by his Merciful Benevolence preserve, vivifie, and deliver him from all trouble and danger. The Kings of Kings increase and highten the Star of his Constellation, to prolong his dayes over his glorious Kingdome. The King of Kings put it into his heart, and into the hearts of his Nobles and Princes to use benigne Clemencie towards Us, and to the Israel of God, our brethren under his dominion.—Amen."

One notices here the curious variant, " He who made a way through the Red Sea and Pathes through the River Jordan." Perhaps an intentional departure from the usual text, which is taken verbatim from Isaiah's (xliii. 16) " Who maketh a way in the sea and a path through mighty waters." Still more remarkable is the omission of the sentence with which the prayer ends in the usual readings: " In his days and in ours may Judah be saved and Israel dwell securely; and may the Redeemer come unto Zion." Menasseh ben Israel, it will be seen, includes this passage in his reproduction of the prayer with the one alteration of " let the Redeemer come to Israel," in place of " Zion." Why does Leon Templo omit it altogether?

I suggest that the theologico-political attitude of Jewish apologists had undergone a change with the substitution of a Monarchy for the Commonwealth.

It had, of course, been part of Menasseh's policy to conciliate the religious element in England, which was keen on the interpretation of prophecy, giving it a close literal application to contemporary events. The stirring incidents of the Commonwealth, and the deeds and character of its chief hero had roused extraordinary hopes in large masses of the people. The millennium was not far off, only the date needed fixing; Fifth Monarchy men were getting ready for a greater metamorphosis than had ever yet been witnessed. The footsteps of the Messiah might almost be heard by those who listened intently for them. Menasseh, in fact, in his *Addresses to the Lord High Protector*, mentioned among his motives for coming to England: " Because the opinion of many Christians and mine does concur herein, that we both believe that the restoring time of our Nation

into their native country is very near at hand." [1] The only thing needed was that certain other prophecies should be fulfilled first, for according to Daniel xii. 7, the dispersion of the Holy people must be complete, and then their ingathering would also be made complete. Now this dispersion was already very great. The Jews were settled in nearly all countries; even America was shown in Menasseh's *Hope of Israel* to have been peopled by the lost Ten Tribes. All that was now required was that they should be admitted into "this considerable and mighty Island." This only remained to be done "before the Messiah come and restore our Nation, that first we must have our seat here likewise."

But arguments of this sort, if effective in the age of Cromwell, would be likely to defeat their object in the era of the Restoration. Charles II was not a man to be in a hurry for the Messiah. Nothing would have disconcerted him more than his advent. Templo, moreover, probably did not consider the occasion an appropriate one for introducing a special element of Jewish dogmatics, and so stopped short of the wish, "In his days and in ours may Judah be saved, and the Redeemer come unto Zion."

It would be unfair to bring it as a charge against the Jews that, after having prayed for the Protector and the Commonwealth, they prayed for the King and the Monarchy. Obviously no other course was open to them in the development of events in a country they dared not yet call their own. They asked for room to live, and opportunity to take their part in the national life, and they could not but give their blessing to whoever

[1] "A Declaration to the Commonwealth of England."

made it possible for them to realize these not ignoble hopes. But they had nothing in common with those in high places and in low who were in such hot and shameless haste to turn their backs upon themselves. Those were the days of a Waller who, when complaint was made that the poet's congratulation to the King was inferior to the panegyric he had written upon the Protector, turned the position with "Poets, Sire, succeed better in fiction than in truth." Similarly a Dryden could compose such stanzas as these after the death of Cromwell :—

> No borrowed bays his temples did adorn,
> But to our crown he did fresh jewels bring;
> Nor was his virtue poisoned, soon as born,
> With the too early thoughts of being king.
>
> And yet dominion was not his design;
> We owe that blessing not to him but heaven,
> Which to fair acts unsought rewards did join,
> Rewards that less to him than us were given.

Within eighteen months the author indites his "Astræa Redux, a Poem on the Happy Restoration and Return of His Sacred Majesty, Charles the Second," and tells us :—

> For his long absence Church and State did groan;
> Madness the pulpit, faction seized the throne.
> Experienced age in deep despair was lost
> To see the rebel thrive, the loyal crost.

And then addressing the restored King :—

> The discontented now are only they
> Whose crimes before did your just cause betray.

Nothing like this could be laid at the doors of the nascent Jewish community, just beginning to breathe the free air of England. Even if they had not—and we

know well that they had—reason to be thankful both to the Protector and to the King, it must not be forgotten that the Synagogue is not a political organization ; that, like the Church, it has to recognize accomplished facts, and, enjoying the protection of the law, is bound in honour as well as in duty to pray for the highest representatives of the law. And the essence of the prayer as we now use it is that the government may be wise and inspired by just ideals.

ADOLPH JELLINEK

(*From the "Jewish Chronicle," January 12th*, 1894.)

THERE is unanimity for once in Jewry. Without a dissentient voice, so far as I have heard, the verdict has been given that in Jellinek we had, and by his death have lost, the greatest Jewish preacher of our time.

This is no mere piece of posthumous glorification. His rank was assured and recognized before Death—"which shuts the gate of envy and opens the gate of Fame"—had claimed him. People only say now aloud, in chorus, and in print, what they never had any doubt about before.

Once only was it my privilege to hear him preach. His personality was sufficiently striking. A huge head set upon a small frame—the disproportion seemed typical of the preponderance of the intellectual over the material in the man—a face that had in it something of the bull-dog type, reminding one in certain points of Charles Spurgeon, only that the eyes were finer, and, while they did not appear to look at you, attracted you by their "aloofness"; the hands and fingers, those of a young girl—such was Dr. Jellinek to look at. His voice clear, penetrating, yet perfectly flexible; his gesture and delivery easy and graceful; his language, the purest classical German, full and

apt, and, with the enviable instinct of the born orator, not only never pausing for a word, but never missing the right one; his style of treatment the most finished and artistic, exhausting his subject, not his audience—such was the preacher to listen to.

The occasion on which I heard him was the Sabbath, *Parshat Ki-tabo*. His text was Deut. xxvi. 12–15. He drew a picture of Jewish prosperous life in ancient Palestine, and used it to suggest what Jewish life in modern Vienna (and, for that matter, in modern London) ought to be. I saw, and, as I recall the preacher and the sermon, still see, the procession of a nation of devotees pass in a living scene before me. The passage, indeed, is striking enough in the brief original. But under Jellinek's hand it assumed form, colour and movement I had never before suspected; the obscure references soon lightened in the fulness of the speaker's knowledge of Talmud and Midrash; the application grew so naturally out of the introduction that I could not explain to myself why I felt it to be so *new*; while the whole discourse was so free from pedantry as is only possible with a preacher who has "Geist" as well as learning, and something of the Miltonic union of scholarship with imagination. As I listened, I was affected by the sermon profoundly. As a would-be preacher, it humiliated me no less profoundly. For a time I was meditating vows of withdrawal from the clergy. Unless one can preach like him, I said, one should give the world the benefit of one's silence. If the vow has not matured, the explanation is simple. Since then I have heard and read sermons not a few of other preachers, and, though I am far from happy, I am more reconciled. A world which should never be

preached to unless by Jellineks would be in a parlous state of spiritual destitution.

On one feature of his preaching I would like to touch. His use of the Midrash is little less than a revelation—(even to those whose business it is to know something about it)—concerning the wealth of treasure in that inexhaustible mine of homiletic gold.

Of course, we often have the Midrash and the Rabbins quoted in sermons, usually with a few words of commendatory preface on the part of the preacher, which conceal, not too subtly, a little praise to himself for finding them out and introducing them to his audience. But, as a rule, these quotations are stuck clumsily into the discourse, and leave upon the palate the flavour of undissolved spice or sugar in an ill-prepared Sabbath or Festival dish. At best, the sermon holds the Midrash in mechanical, not in chemical, solution. In Jellinek the assimilation is perfect. It is bone of his bone and flesh of his flesh. Whether the Midrash or the preacher's theme came first, which went the longer way to meet the other, is often as uncertain to determine as the question, in the case of some of the finest songs, whether the music suggested the words, or the words the music.

However that question be settled, in a Master's hand, like Jellinek's, Midrash and Talmudic Agadah are wondrous, almost magical instruments. They are bright with ever varying gleams of an exquisite fancy. Antique in form, the spirit that breathes through them is of all time. They produce the most surprising effects, riveting the attention, stirring the soul, rousing the dormant affections, and casting an undreamed-of light upon every subject that fitly occupies the Jewish pulpit—life, death ;

Israel, the nations; our history, our fortune; our shame, our glory, and our hope; the home, the school, the synagogue, the world; earth and heaven; man and God.

Something has been said about what he derived from the old-fashioned Rabbinical school—the Yeshiba—and what from the more modern place of study—the University. Would it not be truer to say that it was to the cross-fertilization of Jewish learning with secular culture that we owe the loveliest flowers and the finest fruit in the garden of Jewish homiletics? Finally, let it be remembered, or rather primarily, that not by "imposition of hands," nor by any special "grace" of the Senate of the University is a preacher made. A man is a preacher "by the grace of God." Such was Jellinek.

My personal knowledge of Dr. Jellinek was enriched by an interview he was courteous enough to afford me one day in July, 1890. The occasion is indelibly impressed on my mind, for on the same day the privilege was mine of seeing and speaking with three men of no less eminence in the field of Jewish learning than Weiss, Güdemann and Jellinek. Partly owing to Jellinek's deafness, a terrible malady borne with cheerful resignation, partly perhaps from other causes, there was little of that mutual give and take usually considered an essential for the art of conversation. It was all "give" on his side, and all "take" on mine. But if he was content, I certainly had nothing to complain of. The magnetic influence under which the listener lay, while Jellinek was in the pulpit, was quite as potent when the speaker had you to himself. All that was needed was to suggest a topic, and forthwith you were rewarded

by a lavish outpouring of ideas, brilliant, wise, witty, lofty or pathetic.

I try to furbish up my recollection of some of the good things that float from him in an unbroken stream in the course of half an hour. I am sorry I can only remember the following: "Early Christianity was the sick child of a sick mother. You look surprised! Read all that is authentic of the century before, and the century after the birth of Christianity, and you will cease to be surprised."

"They are always blaming us because our fathers took away with them some of the jewels of Egypt. I say to our critics, 'you take away our laws, and pass them off as your own.'"

"Have you ever thought what a brave thing it was of Moses to say, 'Thou shalt not worship any other God: thou shalt not make unto thyself an image of deity,' and to say this when all the world worshipped idols? Some one had to proclaim the truth, not half or quarter, or an eighth of the truth, but the whole; and having proclaimed it, to trust that it would make its way in the world. I know of no parallel to this in moral courage and conviction."

"Judaism is a beautiful religion. What a pity it is that the Jews spoil it!"

"Yes," he said, in continuation of some general remarks on Jewish characteristics, "the Jews are incurably inquisitive. Why did Moses write the Ten Commandments on stone? Why not on parchment? If he had acted otherwise, the Israelites would never have been content with simply looking at the document. Every one of them would have put his finger on it, have felt its texture and traced the letters over, and in a few

months the whole inscription would have been obliterated. Wise law-giver, to write his commandments on stone ! "

" About the future ? Judaism *has not yet existed ;* it will exist when developed through the thought, the devotion, the enthusiasm of its children."

These are but weak reproductions of a few from among a crowd of ideas, duly to appreciate which demands that one should have been confronted not merely with the words, but with unique personality of Jellinek. The good fortune that placed such an opportunity within my reach is among the happiest of my reminiscences.

EARLY TRANSLATIONS AND TRANSLATORS OF THE JEWISH LITURGY IN ENGLAND

(Read before the Jewish Historical Society of England, 1898 and 1899.)

I

THE first translation of a Hebrew book into a foreign language is said to have been attended with dismal portents. Three days of thick darkness followed upon the day when the first Greek version of the Pentateuch was ushered into the world. It was a day deemed to be as full of sinister import as that on which the golden calf was fashioned; for that the Law could not be adequately translated into any foreign language. An annual fast (the 8th of Tebeth) was instituted in mournful commemoration of the event.[1]

In such ways the forebodings found expression of devout and zealous men anxiously contemplating an event, the consequences of which were beyond their range of calculation. That there were men who did not share these misgivings, and who regarded every effort to make the Scriptures accessible to other than Hebrew-speaking peoples a legitimate means of pushing forward the spiritual frontiers of Judaism, will cause no surprise.

[1] Sopherim, i. 7; Orach Chayim, 580, 2.

The surprising thing is that, with a passionate devotion to the Hebrew language as the choicest medium of intercommunion between God and man, the ancient Jewish doctors did, nevertheless, insist upon it that in prayer the primary condition on the intellectual side was that the worshipper should comprehend what he was uttering, and that where he was ignorant of the holy tongue, he might pray in any language with which he was familiar, and in so doing would fulfil his duty. In Cæsarea, in Alexandria, and in other parts of the diaspora, Greek was the recognized language of worship.[1]

When one Rabbi [2] insisted that the Shema was to be spoken in Hebrew, because it contained the passage, "And *these words* which I command thee this day, shall be upon thine heart," he was refuted by others, who pointed to the introductory exhortation, "*Hear*, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one." Hearing meant understanding; if less than that, it meant nothing. It is not the mechanical impact of certain waves of sound upon the drum of the ear; it is the mental audition, the intellectual assent of the worshipper that is asked for in "*Hear*, O Israel." And so the rule was formulated and extended, that among the prayers that might be offered up in any language were the Shema, the Amidah or Eighteen Benedictions, the Grace after meals, etc.

Maimonides [3] and Joseph Karo [4] embody this principle in their respective codes, the caution being significantly added, that he who reads the Shema in another language should be on his guard against errors of speech, and should pronounce the words with the same precision

[1] See Schürer, II. 543. [2] Bab. Ber. 13a, Sotah 32b.
[3] Hilchoth Keriath Shema 2. [4] Orach Chayim 62.

and grammatical accuracy as it is his duty to observe in Hebrew prayers. The celebrated Sepher Chasidim, by Judah Chasid, dating from the thirteenth century, re-echoes the Talmudic doctrine, and declares that a God-fearing person who is unacquainted with the holy tongue does well to offer up his prayer in the language he understands.[1] Translations of the Liturgy must then have very early become a necessity. What was true near, and even in, Palestine, and already before the destruction of the Temple, would not be likely to be less true at more distant points in time and space.

It is, however, translations that arose on English soil in which the Jewish Historical Society of England may be supposed more particularly interested, and which, with their authors, form the subject of this paper.

The eye of the inquirer in this field wanders longingly towards the pre-expulsion period. Unfortunately, nothing meets him but a great expanse of possibilities. The early English ritual bore great resemblance to that of France, though the now much-discussed Etz Chayim, of Jacob b. Judah of London, has features that differentiate it from the parent stock. But the Jewish authors of that time used French as their language of ordinary intercourse.[2] Instruction in Hebrew must have been given through the medium of French, and there is high probability that their liturgical literature was not lacking in translations. If Mr. Joseph Jacobs [3] is correct in assigning England as the birthplace of an Oxford MS., dating from the thirteenth century, of a work, *Chukke hat-torah*, treating of Jewish education, we may learn from it the interesting fact that it was deemed requisite

[1] § 588. [2] Zunz, *Die Ritus*, 62.
[3] *Jews of Angevin England*, 243.

for teachers to translate the Bible into the vernacular as well as into Aramaic. Is the work of translation likely to have stopped there? In the French ritual it seems to have been customary on the Seder evening to repeat in the vernacular the first two pieces before and after the second cup of wine.[1] There is great likelihood that the Jews of England, as a body, did not break with that custom. It is true that Dr. Kaufmann, judging from the Ritual of the Seder of the English Jews before the Expulsion, compiled by the Rabbi Jacob b. Judah of London before referred to, is led to think that that custom was not kept up in England; but it is not a little remarkable that "Rabbi Jacob of London" (could he have been the aforenamed Jacob b. Judah?) produced a translation of the Passover Hagada for the use of women and children,[2] and thus did for the Hagada, as a whole, what in the French Ritual had been confined to a couple of the more important passages alone. Will this have been a solitary production of its kind?

Shall we ever recover this or other versions done on English soil? Most of the documentary evidences of the period, mainly composed of Shetaroth, wear a very monotonous aspect, and have in them, to my thinking, little to inspire delight or even satisfaction in their perusal. Alas! no Court of Exchequer, Record Office, or Rolls Court thought it worth while to preserve those tokens of the spiritual and literary activity of the Jews of England, whose intrinsic value, unlike that of the Shetaroth, would not have lapsed by any efflux

[1] See the Ritual of the Seder and the Agada of the English Jews before the Expulsion, by Dr. David Kaufmann, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, IV. 550.

[2] Zunz, *Die Ritus*, 62.

of time. There is, of course, a very simple explanation of the paucity of Jewish literary treasures during the pre-expulsion period. The exiles carried their sacred manuscripts as the most precious among their possessions away with them into other lands. If one asks whether any are ever destined again to see the light, the question is not so absurd as it appears. Who could have dreamed that fortune would have favoured us, after all these centuries, by the recovery of the very Prayer Book and Hagada in use in England before 1290 ? [1] Perhaps fate may yet prove as propitious in the discovery of the translations as she has been in regard to the originals.

Scarcely have the first threads of our subject been woven, when they are snapped asunder, to remain severed for more than three centuries and a half. The next reference to a translation of the Liturgy occurs in a very unexpected connexion. It is by this time, thanks, in great part, to the researches of Mr. Lucien Wolf, one of the indisputable facts of Anglo-Jewish history that, the expulsion notwithstanding, there was a considerable number of Jews who were residents in, or visitors to, England before the Resettlement. The intercourse between England and Holland was especially active. The records of interments in Amsterdam give, for example, under the dates 1623 and 1625, the burial of the daughter of an English Jew, and of the wife and children of an English proselyte.[2] It is in Holland also that we

[1] Equally interesting, though smaller in contents, is the discovery in Pembroke College, Cambridge, of a page of the Prayer Book used in Bury St. Edmunds in the twelfth century. This has been prepared for publication by the Rev. M. Abrahams of Leeds for the Jews' College Jubilee Volume.

[2] D. Henriques de Castro, *Auswahl von Grabsteinen.*

come across a reference to translations of the Jewish Prayers into English. Our President, whose discoveries in a field he has made peculiarly his own are so often generously placed at other people's service, has drawn my attention to an entry in John Evelyn's Diary, which has hitherto been strangely overlooked. Under place and date London, 1641, Evelyn writes: "I was brought acquainted with a Burgundian Jew who had married an apostate Kentish woman." This Jew gives Evelyn an account of certain quaint Jewish beliefs, as to the end of the world, the transmigration of souls, the responsibility of the Romans for the death of Jesus, and the manner in which, when the Messiah comes, all the vessels of Holland will break from their moorings and convey the Jews from all parts of the world to the Holy City. What is, however, most interesting in this entry is the following: "He showed me several books of their devotions which he had translated into English for the instruction of his wife." Here, then, we have these remarkable points, that a Jew takes to himself a wife of the daughters of Britain, that he converts her to Judaism, and for her benefit translates the Jewish Liturgy—all this having taken place presumably some time before 1641. This Jewish husband of an English woman seems to have been what would be called a strict observer in other respects, for, although Evelyn describes him as "a merry, drunken fellow," he adds, "but he would by no means handle any money (for something purchased of him), it being Saturday; but desired me to leave it in the window, meaning to receive it on Sunday morning."

Again, we are left to conjecture what this version of the Liturgy was like. It would almost appear that before

we get to a still surviving translation of the Liturgy as many must have arisen and disappeared as there are cities buried beneath the upper levels of Rome or Jerusalem.

Not all the translations are by Jewish or by friendly or by honest hands. In 1656, at the time when the question of the return of the Jews to England was passing out of the academic stage and beginning seriously to occupy the public mind, there appeared among a growing mass of more or less hostile literature *A View of the Jewish Religion, containing the Manner of Life, Rites, and Ceremonies of the Jewish Nation throughout the World at this present Time,* with *the Articles of their Faith as now received, Faithfully collected by A.R.* (Alexander Ross). A curious collection of rags and tags drawn from divers sources, mingling fact and fiction with indiscriminate hand, and presenting a strange travesty of the Jewish Ritual. The bias of the writer is sufficiently pronounced. He sees attacks upon Christ, Christians, and Christianity in almost every page, and, always protesting his own perfect impartiality, proves it by falling foul of the Jewish people throughout the world, and attributing to them the use in prayer of " fraudulent and blasphemous words slavered forth out of their hellish mouths." No one who objected to England becoming a vast receptacle for alien immigrants, who, upon " A. R.'s " hypothesis, must have been either vicious or insane, would be likely to open the door to people of whom he believed the things reported in that book. Nevertheless, the renderings the author offers of passages from the Prayer Book are often of interest. The creeds, for example, are well rendered, though the style, as seen, for instance, in the use of the accusative of the noun

with the infinitive verb in dependent sentences, indicates that the author had before him a Latin translation, and not the original of Maimonides' Articles of Faith. There are translations, more or less accurate, of the morning blessings, of the penitential *Vehu rachum* and *Alenu*, of the Sabbath Sanctification, of the Prayers for the Sick, even of the Zemiroth of Friday night, and so forth. They are not likely to have been translated direct from the original. I give two or three specimens. The first is from the Zemiroth, *Mā Yedidut Menuchatech* and *Yom Shabbat Kodesh.*

"Put on clothes that show forth mirth and joy,
Consecrate the Candle that it may burn well,
Depart from all work,
End all thy works on Friday,
Give thy selfe to all sorts of pleasures,
To Fish, Capons, and Quailes,
Take care to be ready in the Evening,
Seek out various delights,
Cramm'd Hens, and many dainties,
Make no small esteeme of Aromaticall Wine, etc.

* * * * *

Go softly for pleasantnesse, and longer morning
Sleep is commanded by the Law.

* * * * *

Silk and Satin clothes are to be high prized,
And they that weare them are to be honoured,
The day of the Sabbath is holy,
O happy man that can keep it exactly,
Let no cares trouble your minde,
Though spiders make nests in your pockets,
Be merry and joyfull-minded,
Though it be with much money of other men's,
Provide the most excellent Wine, Flesh, and Fish,
And with these three furnish thy table,
So large rewards for thee
Are laid up here and there." [1]

[1] Pp. 233–4.

The following is from the Confession of the sick and dying :—

" I acknowledge and confess before Thee, O Lord my God, God of my Fathers, God of the spirits of all flesh, that my health and death is in Thy hands. Restore me, I pray Thee, to former health, be Thou mindful of me, and hear my prayers, as in the time of King *Hezekiah* when he was sick : but if the time of my visitation be come in which I must die, let my death be an expiation for all my sinnes, iniquities, and transgressions, which I have ignorantly or knowingly committed since I came into the world. Grant, I beseech Thee, that I may have my part in Paradise and the age to come, which is appointed for the righteous, and make known to me the wayes of eternal life, fill me with the joy of Thy countenance for ever. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, which hearest our prayers." [1]

The prayer at the office of *Shinnui has-shem*, Change of Name, now almost entirely out of use among Western Jews, is thus reproduced :—

" The Lord have mercy upon *N.* and restore him to life and health, and let his name hereafter be called *N.* (*sic*), and let him rejoice in Thy name, and be confirmed in it, etc. Let it, O God, I pray thee, be Thy good pleasure that the changing his name may take away all hard decrees, and alter the sentence of death given out against him : if death be decreed to *N.*, yet it is not to *N.* ; if a decree be made against *N.*, yet it is not against *N.* Behold this houre he is as a new man, a new creature, and as a child new born to a good life and length of dayes." [2]

The year 1689 gives us the earliest translation into Spanish of a book on the Jewish Ritual, by a minister of an Anglo-Jewish Congregation. The *Compendio de Dinim que todo Israel Deve Saber y Observar*, though printed in Amsterdam, was the work of David Pardo, Cantor of the Portuguese Congregation in London. The little volume is somewhat outside the scope of our

[1] P. 402. [2] P. 403.

title, and I will not refer to it further than to say that it is a concise handbook of the more important Ritual Laws, and that its author belonged to a remarkable family, which gave Chachamim (Rabbis) to Amsterdam, Surinam, and Jamaica, as well as Cantors to London, who in their day were as learned as some Chachamim.

We now come to the first Jew who endeavoured to give to English-speaking people, and primarily to non-Jews, some idea of the contents of the Jewish Liturgy. I might, perhaps, have made mention of the English version by G. Chilmead, which appeared in 1650, of Leon Modena's Italian work on *The History of Modern Jews*, containing a translation of some of the Blessings. But it is to Isaac Abendana that we are indebted for most ably showing forth to the educated Christians in England some of the beauties of the Jewish Prayer Book. Isaac Abendana was the brother of Jacob Abendana, who was chosen Chacham of London, in succession to Joshua da Silva, in 1680. He belonged to a family of scholars.[1] His brother, the Chacham, probably by way of reply to attempts made to convert him by a Professor (Antonius Halsius) at Leyden, translated the Cuzari, Jehuda Halevi's system of the Jewish faith, into Spanish. But Isaac's activity seems to have been even more considerable than his brother's. He translated the Mishnah and parts of Maimonides' Yad Hachazakah into Spanish. Together with his brother, he edited, with additions, the *Michlol Yophi*, and translated (the lion's share of the work falling to him) the whole of the Mishnah into Latin—a work which is in manuscript in six volumes in the Cambridge University Library. Coming to England with his brother Jacob, he settled in Oxford, became a

[1] See Kayserling, *Analekten* in Frankel's *Monatschrift*, vol. ix.

teacher of Hebrew, gave lectures in Hebrew literature, and also spent several years in similar pursuits at Cambridge.[1] He is said to have been a man of delightful conversation, and certainly he had the tact, while writing in a manner that could not but advance respect for Jews and Judaism, not to utter a word that might give umbrage to Christians. He was in correspondence with many learned Christians ; two inedited letters of his to Buxtorf the younger, one in Hebrew and the other in English, are extant.[2] For several years he published a Jewish Calendar, to which it was his habit to affix a dissertation on some subject of Jewish interest. Those for 1695 and 1699 are enriched respectively with " An account of our Publick Liturgy as at this day established among us," and " A Discourse concerning the Jewish Fasts, wherein is a brief Account of the Great Day of Expiation." They are avowedly intended to give Christians an idea of Jewish rites and tenets.

The latter of these short treatises contains, among other things, a description of the Abodah, the High Priest's ministrations in the ancient Temple. It is almost literally translated from Mishnah Yoma, and is as lucid as the original, offering in this respect a striking contrast to the involved and difficult Piyut, by Meshullam b. Kalonymos, which in our Atonement Service takes the place of the Mishnaic account. Here is a specimen : —

[1] The two men Isaac and Jacob Abendana are often confounded, and Jacob absorbs all that belonged to Isaac, probably on account of his official position. Even Dr. Ginsburg, in his article on " Abendana " in *Kitto's Encyclopædia*, inextricably confuses the two men as well as their works.

[2] Carmoly, *Médecins Juifs*, i. 178 ; Kayserling, loc cit.

" Then he went to his sin-offering which stood between the porch and the Altar, and laying both his hands upon its head, confest both his own and family's sins, after this manner : ' O Lord, I and my house have committed iniquity, rebell'd and sinn'd against Thee : therefore, O Lord, I beseech Thee, pardon the iniquities, rebellion and sin, which I and my house have committed, according to Thy promise made to this purpose in the Law of Moses.' " [1]

The form of resolution on the day previous to a voluntary fast is thus rendered :—

" O God, the Governor of the world, I resolve here, in Thy awful presence, to afflict myself with fasting to-morrow. O my God and God of my forefathers, be pleas'd to receive me favourably, and graciously to hear my Prayers and answer my Supplications. O Thou that hearest the Prayers of all men, heal me ; and let the words of my mouth and the thoughts of my heart be always pleasing in Thy sight, O my Strength and my Redeemer." [2]

A passage or two from his Account of our Public Liturgy can hardly fail to interest. First, a few sentences from his introductory remarks :—

" As to the first requisite in prayer, viz., the qualifications of the party that prayeth, be it observed that he must be duly prepared and disposed in mind and affection before he presume to appear in the presence of God, and that such previous dispositions are to be procured by a serious meditation on the great solemnity of the action he is going about. (To which purpose 'tis observable, that some of our pious ancients did use to tarry some short space in the synagogue before prayers begun, the better to settle and compose their thoughts.) At his entrance into the places of publick worship he must behave himself with all agreeable reverence, as being sensible of the great holiness and sanctity thereof. Pursuant hereto his thoughts must be sequestred from all vain and frivolous objects, and fix'd with the most serious attention on the duty which he is engag'd in, as knowing that wand'ring desires, and lazy, or formal, or hypocritical devotion, will find no acceptance with

[1] P. 10. [2] P. 86.

God who searches the heart, and expects we should wholly dedicate that to Him, and commands the service of the mind, as well as of the mouth. To attain this end he must repeat his prayers seriously, gravely, and deliberately, without haste or precipitation, that his heart and his tongue may go together, and God may be glorified by that as well as this." [1]

The summary he gives of the Shemoneh Esreh is admirable in every way, while it would be difficult to offer a better explanation or a more suitable version than that contained in the following :—

"But because these prayers, being of a considerable length, cannot in a short space of time be performed, especially in the manner above related; and because the exigencies of our affairs may sometimes be such that we may have not sufficient leasure to attend them: therefore in cases of extreme danger to our persons, as in times of war and persecutions, and insuperable difficulties and necessities, as in a journey that requires haste and expedition, some use the following form: 'The necessities of Thy people are many; their understanding is weak; may it please Thee, O Lord our God, to grant us what is sufficient for our sustenance, and to send a supply proportioned to every man's wants, and do what is good in Thine eyes. Blessed be Thou, O Lord, that hearest prayer.' Others, instead of that form, do on the like occasions use this following, entitled *Habhenenu*, being a compendious abstract of the nineteen principal prayers, beginning at the fourth and ending with the sixteenth, and is thus conceived: 'Give us understanding, O Lord our God, to know Thy ways; circumcise our hearts, that we may fear Thee; grant us pardon that we may be cleansed from our sins; remove from us all grief and sorrows; grant that we may enjoy the pleasures of Thy habitation in Thy holy Land; gather the dispersed from the four corners of the earth; judge them that do err from Thy Law; let the righteous be glad in the restoration of Thy holy City, the re-establishment of Thy Temple, and the restitution of the Kingdom of David, that his name may shine, and his Crown flourish; before we call, do Thou answer, and whilst we are yet speaking, do Thou hearken; for Thou art our Redeemer and Deliverer in all our

[1] Pp. 4–5.

tribulation and distress. Blessed be Thou, O God, that hearest prayer." [1]

You will have no difficulty in recognizing in all this the English of a cultured scholar of that age. If Isaac Abendana had undertaken a complete translation of our Liturgy, the work of subsequent translators would have been greatly facilitated or might have been rendered superfluous; and I know at least one version of the Prayer Book which would probably never have seen the light.

Returning now from English to Spanish translators of our Liturgy, we have to notice the work of two very remarkable men. Of a high order of merit was the contribution towards the translation of the Liturgy made by Daniel Israel Lopez Laguna. Born in France about the year 1660, a Marrano, he passed as a youth into Spain, where he made practical experience of some of the terrors of the Inquisition. Equipped with the learning he had managed to gather in both countries, he escaped from Spain and found his way to Jamaica, and later to London. His life had been one of constant peril in its earlier stages, and full of trial and suffering to the last. Like many another who had made acquaintance with griefs, he found in the Psalms at once a reflex of his sorrows and a spring of comfort under them. He was among those unhappy ones who "are cradled into poetry by wrong." The fruit of many years' labour was given to the world in London in a metrical translation of the Psalms under the title of *Espejo fiel de Vidas*—Faithful Mirror of Lives. The book has a subjective colouring, his own experience being occasionally introduced into the very words of the text. But

[1] Pp. 28–29.

it was esteemed a very notable production, and the poetical spirit that breathed through it inspired quite a little host of admirers to break into song in commendation of it.[1]

Of the very highest interest, however, in connexion with our subject are the Spanish translations, which appeared in London in 1740, of the Prayers for New Year and Atonement (the latter supplemented by a translation of Ibn Gabirol's Keter Malchut) and that of Daily Prayers, New Moon, Hanucah and Purim, published thirty-one years later—both by Isaac Nieto. Isaac had succeeded his father, the celebrated David Nieto, in the Chachamship in 1728. There were of course earlier translations for the use of Spanish Jews ; but they were generally in the Judæo-Spanish jargon, against which the cultured spirits of that time already revolted. A remarkable point about these Spanish translations is that they were printed without any corresponding Hebrew text—a practice in which Nieto was but following the example of the earlier editions of Amsterdam.

The question is for whom these translations were intended. Some imagine that they were designed for the special use of women and children. But the writers make no mention of such a purpose, and that these Prayer Books were equally intended for the use of men is evident from their containing the old formula : " Blessed art Thou, who hast not made me a woman." Ignorance of Hebrew is not, as is too readily taken for granted, the discreditable mark of our own age exclusively. In this respect, as in a good many others, the caution may serve : " Say not, How is it the former days were better than

[1] See Kayserling's *Sephardim*, p. 297, and Graetz, *Geschichte*, X. 326.

these ? " During the last century the cry was already heard, in pamphlets and elsewhere, that Hebrew was an unknown tongue to many Jewish worshippers. Abraham Pimentel, a distinguished member of the Portuguese community in the early part of the last century, in a preface to Laguna's Version of the Psalms, says distinctly that " our brethren who have fled from Spanish and Portuguese persecutions hither to London were compelled to pray in Spanish because of their ignorance of the Hebrew." [1] The truth is that the Marranos, men as well as women and children, were nearly always unacquainted with Hebrew, though in other respects abreast of the culture of their age, and it was to satisfy a taste trained and educated on a pure Spanish dialect that a different sort of version was needed from that offered in the corrupt jargon whose fate it has somehow been, whether in the Spanish or the German variety, to be regarded with a species of superstitious awe, and as but one degree less inspired than the Hebrew original.

With a courage and an enlightenment deserving of all praise, Isaac Nieto set himself the task of dethroning the Judæo-Spanish jargon and setting up a more legitimate successor in its stead. In his Introduction to the *Orden de las Oraciones de Ros-ashanah y Kippur*, he gives vent to the general complaint concerning the decline of the devotional spirit. The cause, he thinks, is to be sought in the little regard manifested for the requirements of the more educated classes. People said they did not understand what they uttered, and how was devotion to be excited by means of words without meaning ? The version in use was full of unsuitable, bar-

[1] See *Early Jewish Literature in America*, by G. A. Kohut, in *Publications of the American Jewish Historical Society*, III. 111.

barous, uncouth, and obsolete expressions; the style was unworthy to be employed in prayer to the Eternal Omnipotent God. If it was possible to improve upon the old translation, and to give the sense in terms the most appropriate and the most intelligible in use in the language, why not do it? Were we to venerate mistakes because they were old, or to respect what is unbecoming because it was ancient? Languages change in the course of time. It was our duty to amend our versions in the measure in which the language became modified. Again, who did not know how widely the Hebrew language differed in character and construction from the Castilian? If we prayed in Castilian, it was because we were ignorant of Hebrew; but if a translation was full of Hebraisms, that would be to make us pray in Castiliano-Hebrew, something that was neither Castilian nor Hebrew. Then Nieto turns upon, and effectually disposes of, the arguments of those who justify their use of the old corrupt translations on the ground that there is a peculiar sanctity and mystery attaching to versions of this sort, which would vanish if another medium were resorted to.

The credit of producing the first printed Jewish Prayer Book in the English language belongs again to the Spanish and Portuguese branch of the community. This time, curiously enough, it is not in London, but in New York that it sees the light. The book, a small quarto of 191 pages, is entitled *Prayers for Shabbath, Rosh Hashanah and Kippur, or the Sabbath, the Beginning of the Year and the Day of Atonements; with the Amidah and Musaph of the Moadim or Solemn Seasons; According to the Order of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews, Translated by Isaac Pinto, and for him printed by John Holt, in New York*, A.M. 5526=1766. The book may, how-

ever, by a little breadth of interpretation, be considered as covered by the title of this lecture, because in 1766 the United States had not yet formally severed their connexion with England. Taking England, by synecdoche, for the British Empire, Isaac Pinto, publishing his English Prayer Book in New York, may be classed among the early translators of the Jewish Prayer Book in England.

The Preface is interesting, as it affords another indication of the state of Hebrew knowledge at the time. After expressing his conviction of the importance of Hebrew as a medium of Prayer, the translator continues that that language " being imperfectly understood by many, by some not at all, it has been necessary to translate our Prayers in the language of the country wherein it hath pleased the Divine Providence to appoint our lot. In Europe, the Spanish and Portuguese Jews have a translation in Spanish, which, as they generally understand, may be sufficient ; but that not being the case in the British Dominions in America, has induced me to Attempt a Translation, not without Hope that it may tend to the Improvement of many of my Brethren in their Devotion." Pinto acknowledges his indebtedness to " the elegant Spanish Translation " of " the Learned and Reverend H. H. R. Ishac Nieto." As in the case of the Spanish translations to which I have referred, no Hebrew appears in the book, and this fact would seem to show that there must have been an appreciable number of persons in the last century who, for purposes of private worship at least, and perhaps also while in attendance at synagogue, depended upon English alone in their devotions.

Some crudities there are in this translation, but few

serious mistakes, and the style has a genuine devotional ring, as a single passage will testify. It is

THE CONFESSION OF THE MUSAPH, OF RABBENU SHEM TOB BEN ARDUSIEL.

Ribbono Shel Olam.

"Lord of the World! When I consider that the lustre of my Youth is departed, and that my Prospects are all of them become as a mere Shadow; while my Sins appear red as Scarlet, although my Locks are white as Snow, according to the Great Number of Years wasted in the Pursuit of every Lust, and which have been spent in transgressing every Precept; now alas! at an End without Hope, I almost despair the obtaining a Reformation, or that I shall be able to repent, while the Time is thus short, and the Labour exceeding great. Oh when will the Time come (I was wont to say), that I may publickly confess the sins I have with Presumption committed; Now that the Time is come, how shall I confess, in the few hours I have remaining, the Sins and Iniquities which I have committed? Or that I should even be able to mention them, when to enumerate them Words would be wanting; If to write them, Books and Volumes would not contain them: Days and Nights would be consumed in the Confession, and there would yet remain the greater Part to be confessed. Nevertheless, if with pleasing and mellifluent Words, I implore Forgiveness of my Transgressions, how good, and how agreeable would it be? I will begin then with the Confession of the Sin of an Evil Tongue; I will entreat with tender Expressions for the Sin of the Dissoluteness of Speech. As the Mouth hath been the occasion of the Crime, may it now be the Instrument of obtaining Pardon. But alas! How shall the Speech of Lips be able to obtain Forgiveness for the Blood wherewith the Hands are stained, or for the Violence they have done. For the Sins past and present already perpetrated and committed. Of what avail can the Confession of a deceitful Tongue be? What Advantage can it be to him that is laden with Wickedness, the many unprofitable Confessions, however frequent they may be made? For the Expiation of Transgression doth not consist in the Multitude of Words: Is the Health of the Soul to be obtained by the Motion of the Lips, however Eloquent, whilst the Heart retaineth Malice, and the Thoughts are immersed in every Abomination? And although my Tears should fall in Drops,

as the Rain, to entreat for the Sin which I have committed against Thee through error, I should nevertheless be accountable before Thy divine Tribunal, for the Sin which I have presumptuously committed against Thee: Or if I were to hope obtaining (as it were by a Miracle) Pardon for the Sin which I have committed against Thee by Constraint; Woe of me, if I must suffer Pain both in Body and Mind, for the Sin which I have committed against Thee, with my Free Will. And although I earnestly intreat, and my Pardon be granted for the Sin which I have committed against Thee in Secret; yet my Heart would be parched up in the Fire of Terror, for the Sin which I have committed against Thee in Public. Or if I should say, I will for this Time fly from Thy Presence until Thine anger be passed over; how inconsistent! When the whole Earth is full of Thy Glory, and there is none to deliver from Thy Power; the very grave is naked before Thee: Whither shall I fly from Thy Presence, when there is nothing hid from Thine Eyes? If I ascend up into Heaven, Thou art there; and if I make the Grave my Bed, Thou art there. I will be Dumb, and put my Hand to my Mouth; I am ashamed and confounded. With Heart fearful, and trembling, absorpt and amazed in Mind, the Thoughts in Suspense, unable to determine between liberty and constraint, possible and impossible; uncertain which may be the most proper, whether to stand or fly, whether to be fearful or have Hope; halting between two opinions; whether I ought to call my Iniquities to Mind, or endeavour to forget them; whether I should speak or hold my Peace? O the dreadful Situation! If I am silent my whole Frame trembles; And if I speak my Crimes are then discovered: O the Remorse of my Heart, at my past Life! If I think of hiding my Iniquity in my own Bosom, and to lodge it in my own Breast, my Countenance would be an Evidence of my Guilt: But above all, the Judge intuitively beholdeth the most profound Secrets; and before Him there is no Oblivion. He respecteth not Persons, nor will He receive Bribes. How very precious a thing is the Redemption from Sin, and how shall I, that am poor and indigent in good Works, be able to obtain Purification. I will therefore bow down my Head as a Reed, my Tears tinged with my Blood through Grief: And Inwardly I am rent in Pieces through Anguish.

"But I stand self-reproved, my own Mind answering me with Encouragement, saying: Although the Judge is awful and tremendous, yet earnestly intreat for Redemption, for there is still time; nor dispair obtaining Mercy, For the Sun is yet

high, and hastened not yet to set, as a perfect Day: That there may be Time for thy penitential Cry, and a Door opened to thy Prayer, to grant thy Request: And although thy Crime be ever so great, God is still infinitely greater to forgive, and if thy Sins are as the Waters of the Sea, and the Waves thereof, and thy Offences as the Stars of Heaven and their Hosts, consider that the Mercy of the Lord is Eternal: And if thy Iniquities surpass the Clouds, his divine Favour excelleth the Heavens, even the highest Heavens."

Messrs. Joseph Jacobs and Lucien Wolf assert [1] that the Mahamad would not allow this translation to appear in England. If this is a fact, it is a very mysterious one, considering that the Spanish translation of Nieto had been produced with the licence of the Mahamad twenty-six years earlier. However, the ways of congregations are sometimes mysterious, and their earlier course is not always a guide to that which they will later adopt. But this other fact also remains, that whatever the Spanish Jews in those days undertook was done with a happy union of knowledge, dignity, and zeal. I wish we could say the same of the German and Polish element of that period. Zeal there may have been, but there was little either of knowledge or dignity. Reference must first be made to a volume entitled *The Book of the Religion, Ceremonies, and Prayers of the Jews. . . . Translated immediately from the Hebrew by Gamaliel Ben Pedahzur, Gent; Printed in London in* 1738. It is a pretentious volume, and one is at a loss whether to be more amused at the audacity or at the ignorance of this "Gent." Internal evidence shows him to have sprung from the Ashkenazi section of the community. This is his notion of the meaning of the Kaddish (Gamaliel, p. 163):—

[1] *Bibliotheca Anglo-Judaica*, p. 174.

Reader goes on with a loud voice.

He shall be magnify'd, and he shall be sanctify'd; O his great name in the world, his word, and his will; and he shall be king over all his kingdoms, in your lifetime, and in your days, and during the life of the whole house of Israel, in his triumphal chariot, yea very speedily, and ye shall say, *Amen.*

Cong.—Amen. His great name shall be blessed everlastingly, throughout all worlds he shall be blessed.

Reader goes on with a loud voice.

He shall be blessed, and he shall be praised, and he shall be beautify'd, and he shall be exalted, and he shall be raised, and he shall be adorn'd with majesty, and he shall rise, and he shall be extoll'd; O the name of the holy one, blessed is he.

Cong.—Blessed is he already and for ever.

Reader goes on with a loud voice.

Already and for ever with all the blessings and singings, praises and comforts it hath been said in the world, and ye shall say, *Amen.*

Cong.—Amen. O that he may with mercy and with a good will accept our prayers.

Reader goes on with a loud voice.

He shall accept of their prayers, and of their desire of the whole house of Israel, offered up before him, who is their father which is in heaven, and ye shall say, *Amen.*

Cong.—Amen. The name of the Lord shall be blessed, from now unto the end of the world, for ever.

The *Al Chet* becomes as follows in his hands:—

"And for the sin which we have sinned against thee with a lofty neck . . . with painting our eye . . . with the help of a cross-eye . . . with an uncovered, or light and giddy head. . . . And for the sins for which we deserved (the four dying sentences of the house or hands of justice) Stoning, Burning, Slaughtering, Strangling, on account of statutes commanded to be observed and on account of statutes commanded not to be observed, whether they be subsistant, thou shalt perform them; and if they be not subsistant thou shalt perform; yea those discovered unto us, and even those which are not discovered unto us, we have already spoke of them unto thee," etc.

But the topmost summit of absurdity is reached in Gamaliel ben Pedahzur's version of R. Ishmael's thirteen exegetical rules by which the Torah is expounded :—

" Rabbi Yeshmoel saith, that the law is preached in thirteen different ways, by concluding the easy from the difficult, and from judging between two equalities, from a main text written in one place and from a main text written in two several places, from generals and particulars, and from particulars and generals ; the general and particular and general, you cannot judge but as a particular of generals ; for it must be of particulars, and of a particular ; for that must be from a general, and all things that have been generals, and proceed from generals, to learn and not to learn, answer for themselves, but to learn of the generals answers all ; and everything that was in the generals and went to reason any other reasoning not to the purpose, is counted easy and not difficult, and everything that was in general and went to judge of a new thing, thou couldst not answer him to generals till the text is turn'd to generals explained, as learning the matter from its circumstances, and learning the matter from its conclusions. And so it is with two texts that contradict each other till the third text comes in and determines between them." [1]

The translator considerably adds in a note, " This paragraph of R. Yeshmoel is just the same incoherence in the Hebrew as it is here in the English." The excuse recalls the well-known method of the schoolboy who hands in incomprehensible translations of classical authors and defends himself by pleading that the obscurity is in the original. The argument is rarely accepted as conclusive by judges.[2]

Efforts were made, when the century had passed three-

[1] P. 15.

[2] There is strong reason to believe that Gamaliel ben Pedahzur was an apostate from Judaism, and that his book was intended to cast ridicule upon the community whom he had deserted. The reader will probably be inclined to think that Gamaliel has unintentionally succeeded in making himself ridiculous.

score and ten, to improve upon Gamaliel, and, partly with this avowed object, the first English translation of the Prayer Book as a whole was produced by B. Myers and A. Alexander. It was not a very decided step in advance, and what was best in the book must have been due to Mr. Myers rather than to Mr. Alexander. This is the conclusion one arrives at on examining Alexander's independent work. I am sorry to say Alexander translated the whole of the Festival Prayers of the Portuguese Rite. It was a melancholy performance. Indeed, it almost seems as if the worst literary service ever rendered to the Portuguese was done by an Ashkenazi, and, as an Ashkenazi, I feel inclined to apologize to them. In justice to our sister community, I should mention that the translation does not bear the Imprimatur of the Mahamad. Wise Mahamad!

Mr. Alexander was a bold, bad, book-maker. He published, among many other things, *A Key to Part of the Hebrew Liturgy*, which, for its size, is about as big a fraud as I know, page after page being lifted bodily, without acknowledgment or hint, from Abendana's work of nearly eighty years before—a sort of liturgical resurrection-pie. What his style and that of his "assistants" was like you may gather from a specimen taken from the Hagadah, which was their joint production. It appeared in 1770, and was the first edition of that portion of our Liturgy printed with a translation and directions in English.

"On the first and second night of Passover, the table at every family's house is set off thus: The tablecloth is on as usual; in the middle of the table stands a large dish cover'd with a napkin, on the napkin is laid a large Passover cake, mark'd with three notches, which cake is called *Yisrael, Israelite*, that cake is cover'd with a napkin, and on the napkin is laid a second

cake, with two notches, which cake is called *Levi, Levite,* that cake is cover'd with a napkin, and on the napkin is laid a third cake, with one notch, which is called *Cohen,*[1] *a priest of the tribe of Aaron,* that cake is cover'd with a napkin, on which stands a plate, and in the plate there is a[2] shank-bone of a shoulder with a small matter of meat on it, which is burnt quite brown on the fire.[3] A small quantity of raw charvil,[4] a cup with salt water,[5] an egg roasted hard in hot ashes that it may not be broke, a stick [6] of horse-radish, with the green top of it,[7] a couple of round balls *about the bigness of a pigeon's egg,* are made of bitter almonds, pounded with apples, etc.

" Every person at the table has his glass, or cup, fill'd with wine, at this ceremony four different times, as hereafter mentioned, which is called in Hebrew *arba kosot, four cups,* though at supper many more are made use of, but at the ceremonies no more than four.

[8] " The seat of the master is three chairs, set close together, in imitation of a couch, at the head of which are put pillows to raise it high, for the master to lean on whilst he sits at table.

---

[1] " *Kohen, Levi, Yisrael,* The above-mentioned three cakes with one, two, and three notches, are made to distinguish the one from the other, and to know how to place them in the dish, and that the Reader may observe, the one notch is laid uppermost, and that with two is put under that with one notch, and that with three notches undermost. There is another cake which is called *saphek* (i.e. doubtful), because it is uncertain whether it will be wanted for any use at all, and if it should, it is uncertain which of them.

[2] " Is in remembrance of the flesh roasted with fire, that was commanded to be eat this night in Egypt. See Exodus xii. 8.

[3] " In remembrance of the sower herbs, which were commanded to be eat this night in Egypt. See Ibid.

[4] " In remembrance of the sea which the children of Israel cross'd over.

[5] " In remembrance of the Paschal Lamb commanded this night to be roasted whole, without blemish. See Exodus xii. 5.

[6] " In remembrance of hard labour, which made the eyes water, and the green top is in remembrance of the bitterness of the labour.

[7] " In remembrance of working in bitterness in lime and brick.

[8] " The reason is to indicate masterly authority which we are deprived of, being there in servitude and bondage.

[1] " In all families, the meanest of the Hebrew servants are seated at table these two nights with their masters and mistresses, and the rest of their superiors. One cup of wine is always set on the table extraordinary, for Elias, the Prophet, to drink of (which is always drank by the youngest at table in his stead), and always filled, when the rest are at the ceremonies. All things being thus in proper order, and every one having first washed their hands, and seated round the table, the master of the family takes his cup of wine in his right hand (the rest at the table doing the same), he and altogether with him in concert, sayeth."

It is not easy to keep one's countenance as one reads that what our ancestors ate in the land of Egypt was " the likeness of this poor bread " ; that it was called " poor on account it was hard to digest " ; that " Thou didst release from the lion's den he who interpreted the horrors of the night " ; that " he who concealed blasphemy desiring exaltation his corps didst thou cause to purify at night " ; that " Agagi retained an aversion " —the translator's way of saying that Haman bore Israel a grudge—and that the writing on the wall was the work of " the hand that wrote to root out the root on the Passover."

I have already reached the fair limit of a paper of this kind, and I leave for next session the continuation of this subject, which will take up the thread where I now drop it, but will mainly concern itself with David Levi, the man, his writings, and his times.

One word of caution in conclusion. Let it not for a moment be imagined that, much as we value, and ought to value, accuracy in rendering and purity of style, these are the absolutely indispensable concomitants of depth

[1] " The reason is because in Egypt they were all slaves alike, therefore they make all equal, and are obliged to give the same ceremonial thanks for their redemption."

and warmth of religious feeling. It would go hard with the vast majority of mankind not only in the past, but probably in the present also, if such were the case. True enough it is—and I am prepared to withdraw anything I may ever have uttered or implied to the contrary—that, as George Eliot has somewhere said, it is quite possible to be ignorant of all the concords and habitually to violate them, and at the same time to be in no wise lacking in the higher spiritual graces—perfect sincerity of heart and genuine devotion.

II.

When I last had the privilege of addressing this Society, I brought the subject of our inquiry down to the attempts made by Isaac Pinto in 1766, and by Myers and Alexander in 1770, to present the two branches of the community with translations of more or less complete portions of their respective Liturgies, and I left off with an undertaking again to take up the thread of our subject, with more particular reference to the work and the life of David Levi, one of the most remarkable products of the English Jewry of the eighteenth century—a man to whom hitherto but scant justice has, I think, been done.

I have, however, to-night, in the first instance, to take a step backward. For this somewhat erratic course you will see that I am not to blame, but rather that some one has to be praised—though it is not to me that praise is due. Mr. Lucien Wolf, before his presidential sunset, shot a kindly parting ray of light into my not too brightly illuminated field of research. He has placed in my hand an interesting volume which he received from M. Cardozo of Paris. It is a translation in MS. of the Daily and Sabbath and New Moon prayers, together

with the more important parts of the festival services, and the Scripture lessons appropriate to these days, and it is dated at the end, in the handwriting of the major part of the volume, "London, 1729, 23rd August." The MS. is a stout little quarto of 716 pages, written in a very legible script, the ink but slightly faded. Two hands are clearly traceable in the mechanical part of the work. The rite is the Sephardic. The translation leaves much to be desired. Rabbinical passages, like *Ezehu Mekoman* and *Pittum hak-ketoret* are omitted. Difficult phrases such as *ve-tichnas lanu liphnim mishurat had-din*, which even Dayan Haliva, as late as 1852, pleased himself by rendering "Lead us within the temperate line of strict justice," are left untouched; so is the sentence still retained in the Portuguese Liturgy, *she-hēm mishtachevim le-hebel va-rik u-mithpallelim el ēl lo Yodea*—as though the fear of a censor lay upon the translator. There are numerous mistakes in translation, as well as errors in grammatical construction. Yet it is by no means devoid of merit, and it is marked in many passages by a certain vigour of style and quaintness of phraseology, which make one regret the many inaccuracies that are spread over the book. Let me give you a few specimens of the translator's style:—

"For ever may man be in fear of his Creator, in secret and in public, and defend the truth, and speaking the truth of his heart, and awake and say, O God of the worlds and Lord of Lords, it is not for our righteousness that we offer our supplications before Thee, but for Thy many tender mercy's sake. O Lord hear, O Lord pardon, O Lord hear and do, it is not too late for Thee my God, for Thy name was called upon Thy city, and upon Thy people. What are we? what is our life? and what are our deserts? what is our righteousness? and what is our salvation? what is our strength? what is our might? what shall we say before Thee? O Lord our God, and God of

our Fathers, most certain the mighty ones are as nothing before Thee; and men of fame as if they were not, and learned men as without knowledge and understanding, by reason that the multitude of our actions are vanity, and the days of our life are as nothing before Thee, and man has no advantage over the beast, for all is vanity except the soul, for it is placed to give account before the seat of Thy glory."—Pp. 12–13.

"Wind the great horn for our freedom, and set up that great Standard to gather us from our Captivity, and gather even all us from the four corners of the Earth unto our Lord; Blessed be Thou, O Lord, which gatherest the dispersed of Israel."—P. 64.

"To the Renegado shall be no hope, and all the Heretics and informers shall be destroyed, and all our enemies and them that hate us shall be cut off, and the Kingdom of pride Thou shalt pull up by the Root and break it, and Thou wilt consume and cutt it off in our Days. Blessed be Thou, O Lord, which weaknest our Enemies and tamest the proud!"—P. 65.

"Though our mouths were full of singing like unto the noise of the Sea, and our tongues full of musick like unto the sounds of the waves, and our lips full of praise like unto the breadth of Heaven, and our eyes full of light like unto the sun or moon, and our hands spread like as the Eagles of Heaven, and our feet as nimble as the Hart; yet were they not sufficient to praise Thee, O Lord our God, nor to bless Thy name, our King, for a thousand millions of mercies," etc.—Pp. 220–1.

"O God, I was thirsty for Thy Salvation, and I composed my prayer before Thee. Let the soul of Thy servant rejoice, for Thou art full of Light, Let it be unto us for salvation, Let the days of our rejoicing be as the number of days of our affliction, and the years that we have seen evill, Let the strength of the walls and the gates be put aside (*sic*) and Mount Sion alone Thou wilt make to rejoice, the Daughters of Judah shall be glad when Thou stretchest out Thine hand a second time," etc.—Pp. 563–4.

From the Hosanoth of the First Day of Tabernacles.

The whole volume is tantalizing in the extreme. Who was the author? His name is not given, and there is absolutely nothing to indicate his personality. On the upper margin of the first page is written in red ink and

in a different handwriting from the rest, "Cardozo de Bethencourt"—the signature simply of a recent owner of the book. It has been suggested that the work was a translation from another, a Spanish or Portuguese version. But this theory will not hold, because the Spanish and Portuguese translations then in existence were free from gross blunders, and were far ahead in correctness and style of anything the German and Polish portion of the community produced until nearly the end of the century. In 1729, Isaac Nieto was Chacham, the scholarly son of a scholarly father, David Nieto, who died the year previously, and whom Isaac succeeded in the Rabbinate. Neither father nor son would be likely to pass the book. For whom was it then intended and for what purpose? Could it have been designed to be printed? Here was a laborious piece of work, which would hardly have been undertaken without a specific purpose. The most probable conclusion that suggests itself is, that it was intended as a volume of private prayer for some pious but not very learned worshippers. Still it is all exceedingly puzzling, and suggestions throwing any light on the subject would be very welcome. The one clear result at which we can arrive is that the MS. is a proof that already in 1729 the want was being felt among English-speaking Jews of an English translation of their Liturgy, and that an effort, though not a brilliant one, was made to supply that want.

The Mendelssohnian Revival in Germany during the last quarter of the eighteenth century had no counterpart in England. The smallness of the Jewish population, their comparatively recent settlement in this country, the character of their pursuits, which ran almost exclusively in commercial channels, the low state of

education, both secular and religious, alike within and outside the Jewish community, may help to explain the absence among them at that period of men, I will not say like Moses Mendelssohn himself—for genius is always an incalculable phenomenon in regard alike to time, place, and circumstances—but of men of the type of the Meassephim generally. In England, the nearest approach to that activity in religious literature, as adapted to latter-day requirements, which was spreading from Berlin over the whole of the Continent, was made by David Levi. The story of his life and an account of the work he accomplished would form as striking an illustration as is to be found, how a determined will conquers all obstacles, and how little effect adverse circumstances have upon the career of a man who believes in himself. Born in London in 1740,[1] the son of Mordecai Levi, a member of the German and Polish community, he was early apprenticed to a shoemaker. For a short time he practised the shoemaking craft, but without much success. He next turned his attention to hat-making, and to within a few years of his death in 1801 gained a precarious living in this occupation. But there was within him the conviction that the whole of his efforts ought not to be absorbed by the labours, however useful and necessary in themselves, of covering either one or the other extremity of the persons of his fellowmen. Nature had designed him for a scholar in despite of circumstances. He was a diligent reader and an apt student. His talents were recognized by those about him, and a design was formed of sending the youth to Poland to study under his great-grandfather. The plan came to nothing, owing to the departure at that time of his great-grandfather

[1] See *Dictionary of National Biography*.

for Palestine. Meanwhile his Hebrew studies were pursued with ardour; he read Talmud and Midrash to good effect; he made himself master of the commentaries of Rashi, Kimchi, Aben Ezra, and Abarbanel, his knowledge of the last being especially remarkable, and he followed with close attention the works of the chief Christian biblical and theological writers of his time.

He does not seem to have rushed too early into print. In 1783, when he was forty-three, appeared his first printed work, entitled *A Succinct Account of the Rites and Ceremonies of the Jews, in which their Religious Principles and Tenets are Explained.* Such a work was undoubtedly much needed, if only to remove the false and vicious impressions left by works like those of the apostate Gamaliel ben Pedahzur. In the *Succinct Account* the English Jews of a century ago were taught in a fairly intelligent manner what were the beliefs and observances of their religion, and it must have satisfied their wants for a considerable time, since nothing of a superior kind appeared for a good half-century. The book was, however, written with one eye on the Jewish, and the other on the general community, and, of course, contained the usual quantum of apologetics in view of the non-Israelite. Especial attention is devoted to "the doctrine of the Resurrection, Predestination, and Free-will; and the opinion of Dr. Prideaux concerning those tenets is fully investigated, duly considered, and clearly refuted." His mode of reasoning with the Gentile will probably not in all cases commend itself to logicians of the stricter order. Jews had been accused of being (1) superstitious, (2) uncharitable in their ideas about Christians. David

Levi confounds those who charge Jews with superstition by the following method of argument. All our ceremonies are contained in either the written or the oral Law. Now both were delivered by God to Moses to be observed by Israel for ever. Therefore, if you charge the Jews with being superstitious, you charge the Supreme with the guilt of giving them superstitious ceremonies—" And this nobody will be hardy enough to advance." As to Jews being guilty of uncharitableness towards Christians or heathens, the position is more neatly turned by pointing out that, according to the beliefs of the Jews, it is easier for the rest of mankind to be saved than for themselves, God requiring of Jews the due performance of the Law, whereas of the rest of mankind He requires no more than the fulfilment of the seven precepts given to the sons of Noah. The inference is that spiritual intolerance is not to be charged upon a people who make heaven easier of access to others than to themselves.

From the appearance in 1783 of this book on the Rites, Ceremonies, and Tenets of the Jews, until his death in 1801, he was incessantly at work with the production of books on subjects of Jewish interest. His industry was stupendous. Between 1785 and 1787, he published in weekly instalments *Lingua Sacra*—a work with many valuable and some amazing features. It is composed of three parts. In the first, we have a " complete Hebrew Grammar with points, clearly explained in English, and digested in so easy a manner, that any person capable of understanding the English grammar, may, without the assistance of a master, arrive at a competent knowledge of the Hebrew language." It is a solid volume of 366 octavo pages, its usefulness marred

to some extent by the argumentative tendency of the writer, who is at perpetual pains to prove other grammarians wrong. He speaks of "enriching the volume with notes, in which are shown the grammatical errors and inaccuracies of the most distinguished grammarians and other writers in the Hebrew language." His views on disputed points of philology are of the primitive and ultra-orthodox order. He lived, we must remember, before the birth of the modern critical and scientific spirit. He had no more doubts, for instance, about the vowel points having been a direct revelation from the Deity (*Lingua Sacra*, I. 33) than he had that Hebrew was the original language of the human race (*Lingua Sacra*, II. 4). The Dictionary, the second part of *Lingua Sacra*, consists practically of three substantial volumes. It professes to explain all Hebrew and Chaldaic words to be found not only in the Bible, but in the Targumim and the Talmud. In this respect, as might be imagined, it is hardly true to its promise. But it does something more than it promises: it is a biographical and bibliographical dictionary; it explains difficult and disputed passages of the Scripture, and is a magazine of all kinds of miscellaneous information on Jewish law, doctrine, etc. The scientific value of the work is vitiated to a considerable degree by the author's design of "rescuing the lively oracles from the errors of real or disguised friends, and the attacks of open and professed enemies, whether Deists or Atheists." Both these divisions of his work show a serious lack of system, and little sense of proportion. But in both parts the erudition of the author, somewhat undigested it must be confessed, is very striking. It might fit out many an ecclesiastic of a later age than David Levi's with

a good and serviceable stock of the raw material of Jewish Divinity.

Nothing more pathetic can be imagined than the conditions under which David Levi produced his works. His motives were pure and high-minded.[1] Neither diamonds nor gold were to be picked up by pioneers along the rocky road of Hebrew Literature, and lucky was it if the toiler in that unpromising region did not starve for his pains. Compelled to labour at a mechanical trade for a livelihood for himself and family, there remained, as he said, but few hours, besides those which he could borrow from his natural rest, "to compile a work which required at once a degree of study, perseverance, and patience known only to such as have been employed in the arduous task of reducing to index order the substance of many volumes."

A first instalment of the work had appeared, and brought with it bitter disappointment for the author. The Jewish public did not in those days buy works of Jewish scholarship. Some thought he had undertaken more than he could complete, and did what they could to prove themselves right by withdrawing the support on which alone he could complete it. An arrangement with a friend who was a publisher enabled him to get on a little quicker with his task, but it meant sixteen hours at the desk out of every twenty-four, and scarcely the barest subsistence for his household and himself. The first volume saw the light in 1785, and then the assistance which had been rendered him so far was withdawn, and he was obliged to return for several months to hat-making and polishing. Meanwhile, want and sickness were preying on him and on his wife. Yet he never seems to have lost

[1] See "To the Public," end of Part III. *Lingua Sacra.*

heart utterly, and a ray of light broke into his life when a few benevolent people, who saw reason to be pleased with the first portion of his labours, consented to provide the means of carrying the work to a conclusion, repayment of the loan to be made out of the proceeds of the sale of the work. They advanced, in fact, altogether nearly £400. David Levi was profoundly grateful, but it is little short of heart-rending to note the apologetic air with which he refers to the necessity of drawing on these gentlemen for the sum of 18*s.* a week for his support during the progress of the work. When it is considered that he was practically without literary assistance, that he was condemned to the scholar's worst hell—one which not even the imagination of a Dante was lurid enough to conceive—the task of compiling books of scholarship without other books to make them with; that he was unknown to the generality of learned men among Christians, access to whose libraries might have been of much service to him; that among Jews there were at that time few, if any, who could lend him a helping hand; that not a single soul besides himself corrected a line of the proof sheets; that the innate perversity of compositors was quite as pronounced 100 years ago as in our day; and that he was during this period also engaged in writing his reply to Dr. Priestley's letters, as well as in working at Lion Soesman's edition of the Pentateuch, and in correcting the whole edition for the press—it is little less than marvellous to find the *Lingua Sacra* with all its imperfections, produced in three years (1785–87) by this mere mechanic, even though he enjoyed an income of 18*s.* a week during two-thirds of the time.

An appetite for polemics grows by what it feeds on. Of all literary passions, it is, or it used to be, the most

insatiable. David Levi had tasted blood in his first venture, had drunk a good draught of it in his second, and now opportunities came for further indulgence which were to him irresistible. In 1787 Dr. Joseph Priestley, to whom belongs the rare distinction of having been at once eminent as a scientist and redoubtable as a theologian, published a number of "Letters addressed to the Jews," inviting them to an amicable discussion of the evidences of Christianity. They called forth two replies—one by a waggish Oxonian, Solomon de A. R.,[1] who, in the guise of a Jew, delivered a smart retort on the Doctor for his sophisms and contradictions. This pamphlet, however, Priestley considered too coarse to notice. Another reply was given in a series of letters by David Levi the same year. After the manner of controversialists generally, secular and religious, Dr. Priestley considered Levi's answer but a poor affair.[2] Yet on second thoughts he came to the conclusion that it would be right to take the opportunity afforded by Levi's reply, poor as it was, to address the Jews once more. "It will tend to keep up their attention, and may bring forth something of more value." The *Gentlemen's Magazine*, noticing the answers both of the fictitious and of the real Hebrew, spoke of Levi's as of a more serious cast of reasoning than Solomon de A. R.'s, though not so acute, and shrewdly added, "Yet it seems to have weight with the Doctor, who has condescended to give a reply." In the course of a few years it reached the dignity of a third edition; it was evidently appreciated by his contemporaries.

In these letters David Levi addresses Priestley thus:

[1] *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1787, p. 820.
[2] Rutt's *Memoirs of Dr. Priestley*, I. 410.

"As you have invited our nation to an amicable discussion of the evidence of Christianity, I shall endeavour to answer them as far as the extent of my abilities and the little time I have open from my other vocations will permit. Most of our learned men have declined the invitation, (1) on account of aversion to entering into religious disputes for fear lest they might be construed as reflecting on and disturbing the national religion; (2) because the generality of learned foreigners are unacquainted with the English idiom." As to the first objection, Levi maintains that there are no longer any grounds for fear, thanks to the Reformation and the Revolution. Further, we live in an enlightened age, when theological discussion is accounted laudable. With regard to the second difficulty, Levi is impelled to exclaim, like little David, "Let no man's heart fail because of this Philistine; I will go and fight with him." Met with the reply, "Thou art not able against this Philistine," he will answer, "Thy servant slew both the lion (Dr. Prideaux) and the bear (Hutchinson),[1] and this uncircumcised Philistine shall be as one of them. He cometh with a spear (elegance of diction), and a sword (criticism), and shield (sophistry). I am come in the name of the Lord of Hosts (i.e. simple truth)." This counter-attack of Levi's provoked a fresh reply from Priestley, and drew other warriors into the field as well—notably the Rev. Richard Beere, in an *Epistle to the Chief Priest and Elder of the Jews* (1789). Upon these Levi made a fresh assault, and further disposed of a new antagonist, Nathaniel Brassey Halhed, M.P., dealing in effective style with the latter's *Testimony to the Authenticity of the*

[1] See *Lingua Sacra, sub. voc.* אלה, where, by the way, may be read thirty-two pages under that one heading.

Prophecy of Richard Brothers, and the pretended mission of the latter to recall the Jews. Richard Brothers was a crazy enthusiast, who seems to have found, besides himself, at least one other person, and that an M.P., to believe in him as a prophet to the Jews, and who was perfectly sure that the hour was at hand for the restoration of the Jews to their own land.

A few years later (1797) witnessed an even bolder attempt of David Levi. It was nothing less than a defence of the Old Testament in letters addressed to Thomas Paine, the sceptic, whose influence as a bitter foe of the Scriptures was then at its height. It was printed, curiously enough, in New York.[1] Why it had to travel all that way for publication I do not know. Tom Paine had told the Christian critics, along with some unpleasant personalities, that their answers to the *Age of Reason* were mere cobwebs. "It is therefore to be hoped," wrote David Levi, "that these letters, written by one that is neither a Christian priest nor a preacher, and who consequently has no interest in preaching up tithes, as he is but a poor simple *Levite*, without any living in the Jewish Church, may find grace in your sight." The conclusion he arrived at was, "That Moses wrote these books by Divine inspiration is manifest from the exact accomplishment of every event foretold by him." "Of this," he says, "I shall produce such clear and unequivocal proofs as to strike the Deist and the Infidel dumb." Whether the effect was precisely of this knock-down character, evidence is not forthcoming.

In his controversial writings David Levi seems to have had the assistance of one Henry Lemoine, a man

[1] By William A. Davis for Naphtali Judah, bookseller.

of parts, and of some repute in his day. The connexion between the two throws an interesting side-light upon the social life of Jews of the more intellectual order at that period. Lemoine, author and bookseller, was born in Spitalfields, a descendant of a refugee Huguenot family. Together with other minor literati of the day, he and Levi often supped together at the house of George Lackington, who kept "The Temple of the Muses," the earliest cheap bookshop—then one of the sights of London—a tall domed structure, surmounted by a flag, the interior consisting of a number of circular galleries packed with books, which grew lower in price the higher you had to mount for them. It was situated in a locality some of us cannot help associating with the later annals of Anglo-Jewry, namely, the corner of Finsbury Square. Under the inspiration of old and firm friendship, this same Lemoine wrote in the *Gentleman's Magazine* an elegy on David Levi, after his friend's death.

David Levi's industry was, as I have said, stupendous. Mention must be made of his *Dissertations on the Prophecies*, in two parts, Part I.: Those that are applicable to the coming of Messiah, the Restoration of the Jews, and the Resurrection, whether so applied by Jews or Christians. Part II.: Those applied to the Messiah by Christians only, but which are shown not to be applicable to the Messiah. The whole appeared in three volumes, dedicated respectively to David Henriques, of Spanish Town, Samuel Barreto de Veiga, M.D., of Kingston, and Abraham Goldsmid, of London. The book is a spirited exposition of prophecy from the point of view of an orthodox Jew, who had made himself well acquainted with Jewish and Gentile commentaries, and presented his case with a certain dashing rhetorical

effect. The dissertations appeared between the years 1793 and 1800, but they were in reality the fruit of twenty-five years of research and reflection. David Levi's apologetics, though without a philosophic and scientific basis, were quite up to, and in many respects surpassed, the standard of works of that kind produced in the eighteenth century by Christian champions of the authenticity of the Bible. Even Bishop Warburton's *Divine Legation of Moses*, much bepraised as it was in its day, evoked the not altogether unmerited criticism—

> "So much he wrote, and long about it,
> That e'en believers 'gan to doubt it."

That David Levi's defence is effective enough to convince doubters of our day, I should not like to assert. But at least, this may be said of it, and it is more than can be claimed for a good many apologetic works, that by means of it believers were strengthened in their belief, while unbelievers were not hardened in their unbelief.

But the most solid of the services rendered by Levi to his contemporaries, and bequeathed to his successors, were those in connexion with the translation of practically the whole of the Jewish Liturgies in use both among Sephardim and Ashkenazim. It was in the main unploughed ground, and even where others had done some rough work before him, he went over the whole again and independently, with an insight, a diligence, and a conscientiousness that merit far greater recognition than they have yet received. Regarded merely from its mechanical side, the task was a colossal one. Indeed, the differences between the Portuguese

and the German rites in nearly all but the statutory portions of the prayers, are sufficient to justify us in considering them as two distinct, almost Herculean labours. But the difficulties are gigantic in another sense, as those well know who have tried their hand at the work, by reason of the varieties and obscurities of dialect and style, the curiously cramped poetical forms employed, the tyranny of the acrostic, the wealth of cryptic allusions to the Scriptures, the Talmud and Midrash, and the enormous divergence between the ways and habits of thought peculiar to the liturgists of the Rabbinical and Poetanic Schools and those of a modern European, especially of an Englishman. That he has succeeded in every instance, or that he has always been guided by the rules he himself prefixed to his edition of the Machzor, is more than can be claimed for him, or indeed for any one who has attempted to follow him. But apart from errors of style, and occasional absurdities (such as the one over which we have all laughed—the rubric at the end of the service on Kol Nidré night: "Those who sleep in synagogue say Psalms and the Hymn of the Unity"), and apart from the impossibility of unravelling the meaning of a frequently corrupt text, David Levi's translations are a monument of honest labour and of a sustained and loyal, and, on the whole, a praiseworthy endeavour to enter into the spirit of the original. There is the less necessity to quote him at any length, seeing that his translations are part of the religious outfit of almost every Anglo-Jewish family. Those who would meet him at his best should carefully peruse his rendering of the Hymn of Glory. I offer here a passage from his less known translation of the Fast-day Prayers of the

Sephardim. It is one that is also read in German and Polish synagogues on the Ninth of Ab :—

" Samaria raiseth her voice, saying, ' My iniquities have overtaken me ; my children are gone from me into another country ; ' and Aholibah [1] crieth, ' My palaces are burned,' and Zion saith, ' The Lord hath forsaken me.'—' It is not for thee, O Aholibah, to compare thine affliction to my affliction, nor to liken thy suffering to my pain and suffering : for because that I, Aholah,[2] turned aside, was rebellious and stubborn, my falling off and rebellion rose up and testified against me ; so that in a short time I paid my debt ; for Tiglath-Pileser destroyed my fruit, and stripped me of all my desirable ornaments ; and afterwards to Halah and Habor was I carried captive : be silent, O Aholibah, thou hast not cause to weep as I weep ; I was driven far distant, I have suffered sufficiently ; thy years were protracted, but mine were not.' Aholibah replied, ' I also rebelled, and, as Aholah, dealt treacherously by the husband of my youth : be silent, O Aholah, for my sorrows have visited me ; thou hast been removed once, but I have been cast out often. Lo ! I was subdued twice by the power of the Chaldeans, and the Temple which contained all my glory was burned : and in bitter affliction was I carried captive to Babylon ; I, however, returned to Zion, and again founded the Temple, but I had scarce been established before I was again taken by Edom, and nearly destroyed ; and now my multitude is scattered in all countries.'—O may He who hath pity over all, pity their degraded state, consider their desolation and the length of their captivity.—O be not exceeding wrath to augment their poverty, and do not for ever remember their iniquity and folly : O heal their wound and comfort their mourning, for Thou art their strength and their hope : O renew their days as of old, that Zion may not say, ' The Lord hath forsaken me.' "—Pp. 212–13.

By way of comparison or contrast, let me place before you a few verses from the Portuguese Machzor of Mr. A. Alexander and assistants, from his or their metrical translation of the Pizmon to be said before the sounding of the Shofar :—

[1] " Aholibah and Aholah represent respectively Jerusalem and Samaria."

[2] " See Ezekiel xxiii. 4."

"It is even now that heaven's gates open, mercy to descend:
It is the day that my hands unto the Lord I do extend.
O remember unto me this chastening day and ever after,
The merits of the binder binded, and the holy altar.

In the latter proved by the son begotten by Sarah his wife,
Tho' thy soul be ever so much attached unto his life:
Arise! O sacrifice him unto me
On the mountain, where glory shall come forth to thee.

Unto Sarah he said, Behold, Isaac thy beloved even
Is advanced in years, but not trained in the worship of heaven:
I'll go teach him to worship, his God to fear.
Go, she said, but not a great distance, I pray, my dear.
Depend upon the Lord, says he, that thy heart may cheer.

Of his servants inquiring, Do ye behold the great light
On the Mount Moriah? Yet they answering, To them it was night.
If thus, tarry here, ye stupid, compared unto asses,
And I and my son will behold that which passes.

Both alike advancing to be busied in God's desire,
Says Isaac to his father, Behold the wood and the fire:
But where is the lamb by God designed?
Sure thou hast not neglected such to be minded!

He prepared the wood with heroism and composure of mind,
As you would a ram his son Isaac did bind;
Then was the daylight in their mirrors as night,
His murmuring tears flowing with all their might,
With eyes weeping, but a heart filled with delight.

Acquaint my mother that her joy is fled,
Her son begotten after ninety years wed
Is become fire, fallen by the edge of the sword,
Whither shall I seek some comfort her to afford?

Acuter than the blade to my mother will be the word.
Pray, father, sharpen the blade, he implored;
Be strengthened during the time my flesh is to burn.
Some remains, my ashes to my kind mother return."

In fairness to Mr. Alexander it should be stated that this version is dated 1771 in print. Twenty years

make a great difference in the progress of a community like ours.

Besides the remarkable productions to which I have referred, David Levi translated the Pentateuch in Lion Soesman's edition, and supplied a large number of helpful notes, drawn mostly from Hebrew commentaries. Many prayers on special occasions were likewise written or translated by him, such as those during the King's illness in 1788, on his recovery in 1789, at the Dedication of the Great Synagogue in 1790, and the Hebrew ode on the King's happy escape from assassination in 1795. I submit to you a short extract from his translation of the Piyut, composed by Chief Rabbi David Solomon Schiff for the Dedication of the Great Synagogue. The original is of course in rhyme: "It is the hand of the Lord that hath thus given us honour and glory, grace and favour in the sight of the nations under whose shadow we dwell and are protected, as in this country, where George the Third sways the sceptre. Whose sole ambition is to promote his subjects' happiness, governing them with kindness and equity; and whose amiable Queen Charlotte excels the most eminent women in virtue. May they enjoy a long and happy life, with George, Prince of Wales, and all the Royal Family." Then, after reference to "the right noble and virtuous lady" (Mrs. Levi of Albemarle Street) "who bestowed a princely sum to beautify the house of God," and to her father (Moses Hart, who of his own expense erected the first Synagogue on that site), the poem implores God's favourable attention to the worshippers, and continues, "O may there always be found in this house of prayer the number of ten, to repeat the blessings, Sanctification and Kadeesh, with true

piety and fervour. May we restrain our mouth from idle discourse during the prayer and reading of the Law. Of this let the Presidents and Elders be careful strictly to admonish the community."

With all his passion for controversy, David Levi seems to have had the tact and good sense to keep out of communal disputes. Considering the work in which he was engaged, this must occasionally have been exceedingly difficult. There was a good deal of acidity in the communal system in the good old days, as we shall see when we come to treat of the period of the Alexanders, and it argued not a little for the wisdom and self-restraint of our ardent scholar that he never mingled in the congregational squabbles of his age, but devoted his energies to a scholarship which probably was the best his contemporaries could appreciate, and kept his controversial powder and shot for disputants who hailed from outside his own community.

It is sad to think how hardly fate dealt with this brave man all his life through. A very touching appeal was drawn up on behalf of David Levi by a Christian writer, probably the same Henry Lemoine to whom reference has already been made, in the *European Magazine* for May 1799. "As he had done," says the writer, "a service equally to the two great classes of Jews, the German and Portuguese, by translating their books and prayers, it is to be hoped he will not be overlooked by them in the present decline of his health. All through life he has struggled with circumstances which were unfavourable to study and literary pursuits. These, however, he overcame, because they could be surmounted by fortitude and perseverance; but disabilities from health, at least such as he labours under,

take away the powers of action. Deafness, asthma, and palsy are a combination that have reduced poor Mr. Levi to a real captivity, in which he can no longer use his harp or add to the Songs of Zion. It is the fervent hope of a Christian who has become acquainted with Mr. Levi from a regard of his useful labours, that the only Jew in this kingdom who has endeavoured by his writings to do honour to the chair of Moses will not be suffered by the Jewish nation to spend the remainder of his worn-out life without a competent provision." Within little more than a couple of years after these words appeared in print, David Levi's sufferings, poverty, and struggle were relieved. The translator was himself translated, and the controversialist passed to " where beyond these voices there is peace."

JEWS IN THEIR RELATION TO OTHER RACES.

(*A Lecture delivered in South Place Institute, March 9th*, 1890.)

Ladies and Gentlemen,—I would like to express to you, however imperfectly, the sense of obligation under which I feel at having been invited to take part in this series of discourses on National Life and Thought. Your course of lectures would certainly have lacked one element of completeness, if it had even by implication excluded from the community of nations one of the oldest, toughest, most virile and distinctively marked of races. "The amount of information which people do not possess" about Jews is really prodigious. In an age of insatiable inquiry, when the electric light of publicity plays upon almost every phase and illumines almost every nook of the inner life of nations and families, there is no race on the face of the earth at once so ubiquitous and therefore so open to observation, and at bottom so little understood. You may not go all the way with what Heine wrote in his Confessions; to the main idea, however, contained in one of his remarks, you can hardly withhold your assent: "Neither the conduct nor the essential character of the Jews is understood by the world. People think they know them because they see their beards; but more than that never

was perceived of them; and as in the middle ages so they continue in modern times a wandering mystery." But whose fault is it if they remain a wandering mystery? The more people, and especially our own countrymen, know about Jews, the more they will find that the greatest of all mysteries in reference to them is that there is no mystery. Unlike the shrines of other nations, even our Holy of Holies contained no secret What of mystery then need there be about us, unless it be the riddle, as insoluble to us as to you, of our existence, and of the dual current, about which I shall presently have to say more, that can be traced along the whole channel of our lives.

With the particular doctrines, positive or negative, held by the majority of those who are in the habit of assembling here, I need hardly say I do not in any way identify myself. But your action in regard to my own particular community seems to me to claim some recognition. If I were to go this afternoon into a place of worship of any of the numerous sects into which Christendom is divided, I should hear the Jews spoken of eloquently, dully, learnedly, ignorantly, wisely, absurdly, lovingly, angrily, as the case might be: the only thing which the greater part of the statements there to be listened to would seem to me, as a Jew, to lack, would be an approach to verisimilitude. Among public bodies the distinction is in an eminent degree yours, that in your search for truth you have gone on this as on former occasions to those who may be presumed qualified to speak with authority upon subjects with which they personally are, or ought to be, best acquainted.

On Wednesday evening last in all the Synagogues of

Jewry there was read aloud to the congregations there assembled an old story to which, whatever else Bible critics may have to say about it, they will not deny the merits of dramatic force and, as regards the major part of the book at least, literary skill. It was the account of the perils and deliverance of that remnant of the house of Israel which, after the fall of the first Temple, found a home in lands later on to form part of the Medo-Persian empire. One of the neatest passages in the book is the preamble wherewith the Grand Vizier of Ahasuerus introduced to the King his project of what I might call "A short way with Jews." Many such "short ways" have been proposed at various times. During the height of the anti-Semitic fever in Berlin, about the wittiest thing that emanated from our opponents was the issue of a mock railway-ticket, marked, "To Jerusalem. Single ticket. No return tickets issued." This was not Haman's method, but what he had to say was interesting for another reason. It was not all falsehood: that would have been too clumsy. Haman knew his master too well to offer even such a gobemouches a dish of undiluted lies. It was by no means all truth; but it was a deft mixture of the two, with the evident object that the untruth might pass current by reason of its being in good company, just as those who utter counterfeit coin are generally found passing genuine pieces along with the others in order to cover, and divert suspicion from, the spurious ones. "There is one people," said Haman, "scattered abroad and dispersed among the peoples." Undeniable; the solidarity of the Jewish race is a fact as patent as their dispersion; they are *one* people though scattered.—"And their laws are diverse from those of all other people.'

That is only fractionally true. "And they do not keep the king's laws." That is altogether false; and the inference drawn therefrom, that "it is not to the king's profit to suffer them," is utterly baseless and invalid.

Severe as the accusation sounds, these words express not inaptly the sentiments with which, until comparatively recent times, most of the nations among whom it has been Israel's lot to be divided, regarded them. They have resented that singular and tenacious union among Jews which no geographical distribution seems able to break up; they have blamed them for a spirit of separateness which is both good and evil; good in so far as every race has to work out its own destiny on its own lines; evil in so far as it is the result of the treatment to which their persecutors have subjected them. They have declared them to be a burden and a misfortune to the State, with no more grounds than confident ignorance and ill-governed passions, envy and the desire to have "their spoil for a prey," require to justify themselves.

In the history and literature of the Jews a very different tale is to be read. When once the work of the conquest of Canaan was effected—and not many European nations have the right to sit in judgment upon Israel in such a case—no State of ancient times was more hospitable to the stranger. On the basis of certain fundamental principles of morality there was one law of right, of protection and love for him and the native. In the very Temple of the God of Israel, the prayers of the stranger were welcome. The aboriginal races lived side by side with the conquerors on terms of good-tempered tolerance. When the Jewish State fell, though they

neither forgot Jerusalem nor gave up the hope of a return thither, it was in no rancorous spirit that the Jews lived among their captors. "Seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried captive," was the divine message which Jeremiah delivered to his exiled brethren; "and pray for it unto the Lord, for in the peace thereof shall you have peace."

Their Temple a second time destroyed, and their land a prey to the enemy, the Jews once more found a home in Babylon where the Parthians presented an invincible front to the passion of Rome for universal empire. Congregations and schools arose, the produce of whose labours forms to this hour the chief intellectual food upon which Rabbinic Judaism is fed all the world over. Yet so completely did affection for their new country become rooted within them, that one of their leaders of that period could maintain that "he who quits Babylon for Palestine, transgresses a positive command." [1]

The language of the country became not merely the vernacular of the Jew; it acquired a quasi-sacred character, and prayers composed in the Aramaic dialect found their way into the liturgy of the synagogue, and have been retained there to the present time. Then, too, the principle was established which is expressed in the Talmudic maxim, "The law of the State is everywhere binding law for the Jew," [2] a principle that ever since has regulated the relation of the Jew towards the Gentile communities among whom he has been domiciled, and is itself an explanation of the singularly law-abiding character of the whole race.

[1] Berachoth 24b. [2] Baba Kama 113a.

Without loosening his hold upon his own distinctive laws and customs, the Jew never at any time was lacking in the consciousness of a union with a larger world outside his own race. He read the lesson of the unity of mankind in the first pages of his Bible. The central doctrine of his religious system—the Unity of God—drove that belief still deeper into his heart; for the Brotherhood of man is the logical consequence of the Fatherhood of God. "When God created Adam," says the Talmud, "He gathered dust from all parts of the earth, and with it formed the parent of the human race."[1] Stripped of its garb of allegory, the saying means that the whole world is the home of man, that the very diversities in the families of mankind are within the original design of the Creator, and, as complementary one to the other, help to establish their essential unity. It was no empty rhetoric that spoke in these words. One practical result of such a theory was, for example, the doctrine: "To rob a heathen is worse than robbing an Israelite, because in addition to the breach of the great moral law, there is the profanation of the name of God."[2] Where will you find a broader and loftier spirit of religious tolerance than that which is contained in this comment of the Midrash on Canticles: "'My beloved went down to feed in the gardens and to gather lilies'—'the gardens'—these are the gentiles throughout the world and 'the lilies'—these are the righteous among them?" Or in this from a work that was the offspring of one of the darkest periods of Israel's fortunes: "I call heaven and earth to witness that, whether it be Israelite or Gentile, man or woman, everything depends upon the deeds

[1] Sanhedrin 38a.
[2] Tosefta Baba Kama 10.

that are done, how far the Holy Spirit shall rest upon a mortal ? " [1]

That not all utterances concerning non-Israelites are conceived in the same strain will be readily imagined. The relation of Jews to other races has of course been regulated by the relation of other races to the Jews—and the one will never be properly understood and be done justice to until the other has been thoroughly grasped. It is, however, no part of my purpose this afternoon to recite to you a chapter out of the Romance of Jewish Martyrdom. Read only what eminent Christians like Döllinger and Schleiden have written on this subject, and you will not need to listen to the grim and ghastly record from Jewish lips. This only I will say, that in nothing has Christianity been so un-Christlike as in its treatment of the Jew, from Church Fathers, and Popes, and Grand Inquisitors, and Catholic Emperors, to Protestant Reformers, Statesmen and Rulers, and that there never was a Religion which suffered so little as Christianity during its establishment compared with the suffering it has itself caused since—two centuries of intermittent persecution endured, against sixteen centuries of incessant persecution inflicted.

Until the end of the last century all attempts on the part of the more tolerant among the Gentiles to assert for the Jewish race the status of full brother to other races proved abortive. Even the British Parliament, which in 1753 passed the Jews' Naturalization Bill, was led to revoke its own righteous action the following year, in obedience to clerical prejudice, commercial jealousy, and popular clamour. It is to the French Revolution that the Jews owe their improved position in the modern

[1] Tana d'be Eliahu 9.

world. That prolific parent of good and evil has at least deserved well of *them*. It was the first to do justice, full and unequivocal, to those whom every other great political movement passed over as too insignificant or too contemptible to be taken into account. Mirabeau and the Abbé Grégoire, the one in his desire to secularize the State, the other in his policy of Christianizing the Revolution, as Graetz puts it, both urged on a movement which in an incredibly short space of time succeeded in effecting the complete emancipation of all the Jews under the rule of the Republic. On the 17th September, 1791, the National Assembly decreed the abolition of every exceptional enactment previously in force against them, and thus made them by law, what they had previously been in heart, citizens of their country. He who started as the child, afterwards to become the master of the Revolution, proclaimed the same great principles of religious equality wherever his victorious eagles penetrated. Since that dawn of a better time, the light has spread more and more, though even now it is only here and there that it has shone forth unto the perfect day.

If now you direct your attention to the attitude of Jews towards their neighbours, you are made aware of a most extraordinary, and in its degree a unique combination ; you perceive a national individuality of singular strength and distinctiveness, side by side with an equally remarkable power of adapation to the varying circumstances of their existence. I admit it sounds like a contradiction ; but reality is often a potent reconciler of theoretical impossibilities, and here, at all events, is a contradiction which is being acted out before our very eyes, one that in the play and alternation of forces furnishes all the elements for one of the most impressive

dramas of humanity. One side of the national character has been depicted by Goethe in words to which all the greater weight may be attached, seeing that they breathe anything but a spirit of partiality towards the Israelitish people: "At the Judgment-Seat of God, it is not asked whether this is the best, the most excellent nation, but only whether it lasts, whether it has endured. There is little good in the Israelitish people, as its leaders, judges, chiefs and prophets a thousand times reproachfully declared; it possesses few virtues and most of the faults of other nations; but in self-reliance, steadfastness, valour, and, when all this could not serve, in obstinate toughness, it has no match. It is the most perseverant nation on earth; it was, it is, it will be to glorify the name of the Lord through all ages."[1] True as much of this undoubtedly is, it is not the whole truth regarding the Jewish people. The other side of their character is not less recognizable. They have the power of adapting themselves to their surroundings with a rapidity and completeness that is altogether unparalleled. I do not propose to enter into the philosophical enquiry, What constitutes a nation? But I do venture to contest the assumption that it requires so many generations of residence on the soil, and the ability to show that your ancestors upon arriving on these shores slew the ill-prepared natives, and took violent possession of their land and other effects, in order to constitute you a true Englishman. A man's country is the place where he enjoys the protection of the laws, where he pursues his vocation without let or hindrance, where his home is fixed, hallowed by the tender ties of family life, where the interests and the welfare of his neighbours have become inter-

[1] *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre*, II. 2.

woven with his own, where he can worship God according to the dictates of his conscience, and where his life is able to perfect itself in every direction. Given these conditions, or the chief of them, and the Jew not only becomes soon mentally acclimatized, and assimilates himself to the society by which he is surrounded, but reproduces its distinguishing characteristics in an accentuated form in himself, becoming, as at this day he is often found to be, more German than the Germans, more French than the French, more English than the English. By way of pendant to the judgment of Goethe, let me cite a noteworthy utterance of one of the most gifted women of our race, a valued friend of Emerson's, one whose brilliant career closed far too soon for her people's good, though not too early for her fame. "Every student of the Hebrew language," says Emma Lazarus in her Epistles to the Hebrews, "is aware that we have in the conjugations of our verbs a mode known as the *intensive voice*, which, by means of an almost imperceptible modification of vowel points, intensifies the meaning of the primitive root. A similar significance seems to attach to the Jews themselves in connexion with the people among whom they dwell. They are the intensive form of any nationality whose language they adopt."

Is it well to have kept a people like this at arm's length? It is not alone the Jews who have been sufferers by such a policy. What monasticism did in one direction by withdrawing for many centuries many of the best intellects and noblest characters from the active business of life, that was effected in another by the systematic repression of the special genius of the Jew, and his exclusion from all national fellowship. Both systems have tended to the world's own impoverishment.

Leaving generalizations, however, let us regard the Jews in their relation to some of those countries where they have found a home. As types, let us take three, as widely varied as possible—Russia, Germany, England.

It is of course notorious that the Jews of Russia are, with comparatively few exceptions, but loosely attached to their fellow-subjects, and to the country which is to them in the place of a fatherland. But the marvel is not so much that they are loosely attached, as that they are attached at all. It is not easy to form a conception of the wretchedness in which a system of legalized inhumanity has steeped the lives of between two and three millions of our fellow-men. From his birth upwards the Russo-Polish Jew is the object of a persecution, which, were it not that he has inherited a vast capacity for endurance from generations of luckless ancestors, would soon suffice to crush the whole man within him. Almost every avenue to an honourable livelihood is closed against him. Barriers are put in his own country beyond which he dare not pass. Certain provinces are set apart for his domicile—they are an enlarged ghetto, outside whose boundaries he strays at his peril. The whole of the interior is shut against him as though he were a leper. When he sets foot in it, it is on his way to Siberia. He is enough of a foreigner to be denied the rights of other Russians; he is just Russian enough to be heavily taxed. If he has sufficient means to pay for it, he may purchase at a high price the privilege of being allowed to establish himself in the capital or in a few other important towns. But this elevation has no power of raising his wife to the same status, and should he leave his property to her, the State will not lend itself to so

unnatural a proceeding, and takes charge of the inheritance in perpetuity. If he is drawn for the army and disappoints the string of hungry officials by not bribing them to secure his exemption from military service, he and his family bid each other farewell, without much hope of meeting each other on this side the grave. With his fellow recruits he is drafted off to the other extremity of the colossal empire: for it is the Russian principle—and in this it is quite impartial in its treatment of Jews and Christians—not to foster anything like local attachments in its soldiery. Needless to say that he has no chance of rising from the ranks, whatever his military qualities may be.

But what is resented with especial severity is the thirst for knowledge which, despite all repression, the Jew so often manifests. He presents himself perhaps fully qualified in all other respects, for admission into a Russian University. The chances are that the doors will be closed against him, as the percentage fixed by law of Jewish to other students has already been reached, or has been lowered by a recent Ukase. That the Jew should become more cultured than his taskmaster is not to be thought of. He cannot even be a Christian any longer in peace. The temptation has been and still remains very strong to rid oneself by a single effort, a single concession (the greatest, however, which a man of honour can make), of all these galling disabilities. With this object, and in order to ease the transition to their own conscience, a few Jews have occasionally gone over to Lutheranism, such a step being deemed not so gross a breach with former habits of thought as joining the Russian Church with its image and relic worship. Within quite recent years, however, Lutheranism has

been declared no resting-place for a Jew who wishes to be considered a Russian: and there is now, in a very mundane sense, no salvation for him outside the pale of the Orthodox Russian Church. Add to all this, that a persistent scorn, more biting and degrading than the knout, dogs him at every turn and movement of his life, and that the knowledge that there is one section of the populace against whom all manner of crimes can be perpetrated without disgrace and with comparative impunity, is apt to demoralize the most virtuously disposed of people—and it will be seen that the fate of the Russian Jews is about as melancholy and as desperate as that to which any portion of the human race is at this moment condemned. The hardest thing about the whole business remains to be spoken: these despised outcasts are in many ways intellectually and morally the superiors of their tormentors. If any one considers this a mere piece of racial or religious bias, let him read the address of the Archbishop Nicanor at the University of Odessa in September last. No professional advocate of the Jewish cause could have contrasted more powerfully the Russian and the Jewish characters, or could have spoken in more glowing language of the industry, the sobriety, the self-denial, the parental and filial devotion, the love of learning and the unswerving attachment to their faith of these same Russian Jews.

But they are charged with displaying an invincible spirit of exclusiveness, and with taking to ignoble pursuits, to the vocations of the usurer and the inn-keeper, who make their profit out of the follies and the vices of their fellow-men. You shut up a man in prison without cause, and accuse him of being unsociable! You take from him every serviceable brick and stone, and bid him

build his hut of mud, and then you are surprised that he has soiled his hands!

What an opportunity now lies before the Autocrat of all the Russias and his ministers! True, there is danger in making concessions to an awakening people: is there no danger in refusing them? By a single exercise of his authority the Czar could break every chain that has so long fettered and disfigured his Jewish subjects. And he, or whoever may do it, would have his reward in the bursting forth of a pent-up spirit of loyalty and patriotism: for there is not a people on earth more quick to forgive injuries, and more grateful for kindnesses, than the Jews. But truth makes its way slowly to a monarch's ear. Have not others long been crying for justice in that land where the east and the west have met, and barbarism and civilization are so strangely mingled? We must not complain if their claims take precedence over ours. The Sun of Freedom has always shone last into the gloomy recesses of the Ghetto.

Turn now to Germany The problem there is different in kind, but in certain respects even more acute. The Jews are accused, strange to say, of diametrically opposite faults. On the one hand, they are condemned for hemming themselves in with a tribal exclusiveness which nothing can pierce, for placing around them an icy barrier no warmth of neighbourly love can melt; on the other hand they are charged with being too much *en évidence*, with wanting to take their share and more of public affairs, with desiring to make themselves indispensable to their country. It would perhaps not be a bad thing to let the objectors settle their differences, which seem to fairly cancel each other, and then to deal with the remainder, if any.

The attitude of the Teutonic anti-Semite recalls a grim story narrated of the Emperor Hadrian in an old rabbinical work.[1] A Jew happening one day to meet the Emperor, greeted him respectfully. "Who art thou?" said Hadrian. "A Jew," was the humble reply. "And thou, a Jew, art so bold as to greet the Emperor! Thou shalt pay for it with thy head." Aware of the luckless fate of his brother Israelite, another Jew, who chanced to cross the Emperor's path, thought it wise to show more discretion, and omitted the customary sign of homage. Hadrian stopped him, and again asked, "Who art thou?" "A Jew." "And thou darest to pass the Emperor without greeting him! Off with his head!" The counsellors who accompanied him, perplexed at this strange procedure, expressed their astonishment that such punishment should be dealt out alike to him who did and to him who did not greet the Emperor. "Think you," said he, "Hadrian needs to be taught how to rid himself of those whom he hates?" Something of the same spirit prevails among those who in their hostility to the Jews are utterly regardless of the inconsistency and even the absurdity of their charges against them. It is enough that they hate them. Need those who hate be logical as well?

Nominally, indeed, all Germans are equal before the law. But during the last fifteen years or so, anti-Semitism, that hideous recrudescence of the worst passions of the middle ages, that "stain upon the German name," as the Emperor Frederick called it, has striven to place and to keep the Jew under a relentless social ban. There is no more cruel instrument of torture than social persecution and contempt can become in unscrupulous hands. One

[1] *Midrash Echa.*

illustration may suffice. In Germany the army is everything. The Empire exists for the army, though in official parlance the army is said to exist for the Empire. Under the law of conscription, Jews have to render their period of service exactly like the rest of the population. Perfectly just. But of all the Hebrews who have ever served in the army, and they are to be numbered by tens of thousands, one or two only have been permitted, with the utmost difficulty, to rise to the rank of officer. They may shed their blood on the battlefield, may make the highest sacrifices for the good of the fatherland, as they did in the great war of Liberation as well as in 1870; they may render the most heroic, though less conspicuous, services in giving medical aid to the wounded on the field and in hosiptals; but that they should wear the epaulettes of an officer would be a not-to-be-thought-of enormity. Not even baptism can wash the old Adam out of the Jewish soldier. The corps of officers will have none of him in any shape or colour.

The Jews of Germany have their faults, faults that especially offend because they are so conspicuously within view of all the world: they do not know how to bear with becoming modesty their recently acquired wealth and power. But their worst fault is, that they are too clever, while they lack the grace, which Mr. Lang's Prince Prigio acquired after many adventures, of being clever without seeming so. In England, when the proletariat was enfranchised, the cry among sensible politicians was, "Now let us educate our masters." In Germany, even before the first instalments of liberty and equality were doled out to them, the Jews began to educate themselves. With the widening of their opportunities in our own time there has gone on an educational.

development that has in it something truly astounding. With a total population including Prussia of about 45,000,000, Germany had, in 1887, 562,000 Jews, or 1 Jew to 80 of the general population. One would expect something like the same proportion to be maintained between Jews and non-Jews in the educational world. What, however, is the actual case? Among 1,326 University Professors (exclusive of those who hold chairs in theology) in the German Empire, there are 98 Jews, or about one-thirteenth instead of one-eightieth of the total: of 529 Privat-Docenten 84 are Jews, or about one-sixth. In these capacities they hold distinguished positions in the various faculties of medicine, law, philosophy, arts, science, and agriculture. A similar state of things is observable in the High Schools. Taking Berlin as an example, with a population of 1,400,000, including 67,000 Jews, we find that the total number of students, boys and girls, in the gymnasium, Real-Schulen, Fach-Schulen, and Höhere Töchter-Schulen amounts to 23,481; of these 18,666 are Christian and 4,816 are Jewish students; that is the Jews are four or five times as numerous as their proportion to the rest of the population would lead one to expect; or to state it in another way, every thousand Christian inhabitants of the Prussian capital furnish 14 students to these schools; every thousand Jewish inhabitants supply 72 students.

I take these statistics not from a Jewish but from a Christian source, the Anti-Semiten Katechismus, published in Leipsic in 1887—a book cunningly designed to provide Jew-baiters with all weapons of offence in a handy form, and to rouse the animosity and indignation of German Christians against everything Jewish. Its most triumphant passages are those that point to the

status of the Jews in the educational world as a peril to the State. Surely we may be pardoned if, while accepting the figures cited by our enemies as accurate, we desire no higher praise than is involved in a condemnation based upon such grounds.

Now contrast the position of the Jew in both Germany and Russia with that which he holds in England. The English are slow to move in the direction of any political change; but when the time is ripe for it, and the change is made, it is made generously, ungrudgingly, and without irritating reservations. It is not surprising to those who know how to read the Jewish character that among the many races and religions contained within the limits of the British Empire, there is none that has more completely identified itself with the national sentiments and aspirations than the Jews. Making allowance for the difficulties of undoing the results of long periods of misrule and of inherited tendencies consequent in great measure upon such misrule, the transformation has been astounding at once in its rapidity and in its thoroughness. In every walk of life Jews are taking their share: in professions, in commerce, in handicrafts. They have developed a degree of public spirit, and a civic excellence for which they were little credited before the experiment had been made. They are to be found among the foremost in every philanthropic and educational movement, in every undertaking tending to the national welfare and honour.

It would be difficult to find within the whole range of modern history a more perfect realization than the Jews of Great Britian present of Mr. Freeman's theory concerning the influence which an adopting community is

able to exercise upon its adopted members : " It cannot change their blood ; it cannot give them new natural forefathers ; but it may do everything short of this : it may make them in speech, in feeling, in thought, and in habit, genuine members of the community which has artificially made them its own." [1]

Perhaps the clearest proof of the manner in which the Jews have assimilated the national life of this country is their attitude in regard to politics. On the supposition, into the merits of which this is not the occasion to enter, that the division into political parties is a good thing for this country, the Jews contribute in their measure to the general benefit. They are the appanage of no political party ; they are to be found in every one, reflecting not unfairly the differences of opinion prevailing in the various constituencies themselves. Of course this would be impossible if their emancipation here had been an incomplete one. As it is, their interests are identical with those of the rest of the population. There is fortunately no Jewish question to distract their attention from the wider duties of citizenship. Ill would it fare with a Jewish clergyman who should venture, from his pulpit or elsewhere, to dictate to his congregants how they should or how they should not vote.

Just now, indeed, the public mind is strangely agitated by an industrial question in which the mass of immigrants of the Jewish race and faith are mainly concerned. I believe the agitation will before long die a natural death. The saving common sense of the British people will not suffer fresh disabilities to be invented for, and to be imposed upon one of the most law-abiding sections of

[1] *Race and Language*, by Edward A. Freeman.

the population. It is one thing to protect them against themselves, as others have had to be protected, by improved factory legislation; it is another to condemn them and their fellows to the dismal fate which certainly will befall them if England for the first time reverses its traditional policy in their case. It is not conceivable that the land whose boast it used to be that it afforded an asylum impartially to kings fleeing from their fickle subjects and to subjects fleeing from tyrannical kings, will shut its gates permanently upon those who are drawn hither by the same law of nature which bids a plant seek the light and the air.

But you ask perhaps, apart from the present relations of the Jews towards other races among whom they have found a home, have they any thought or hope of ultimate independence as a nationality with a territorial base and a political centre? Is Palestine still the Land of Promise to the house of Israel? I wish I could answer that inquiry in the name of all my brethren with a single voice. Upon no question unfortunately are opinions more widely divided, though upon none has the teaching of the Synagogue from time immemorial been more unanimous, decided and emphatic. Leaving aside those vacant souls, whose conception of happiness is to be saved the trouble of thinking and the responsibility of believing, the Jewish camp is divided into two parties. There are those among us who have neither heart nor mind for a restored Jewish state and a revived Jewish nationality. The whole notion is uncongenial to them. They will not pray for it, nor hope for it. The ancient memories have died within them, stifled by the weight of their new prosperity. They dispose of the bare suggestion with a smile, and quote the well-worn

jest of the wealthy Parisian Jew who declared that when the throne of David was re-occupied by one of his descendants, he would make application for the post of ambassador of his Judaic majesty at the Court of Paris. But it would be a grave error to suppose that such a method of regarding the destiny of Israel had altogether displaced the faith of centuries—a faith sealed with blood and tears, a faith that lent the one poetic charm to the dark and dreary lives of fifty generations of our fathers. There is still a goodly band of brethren in whom that faith is as full of vitality to-day as ever it was in Israel's history. Every time they open their Bible or their Prayer Book, the sacred flame is fed within them. With a keen eye they watch the progress of events in the East, note with glad satisfaction that the Jewish population of Palestine has trebled within the last half-century, that agricultral colonies are springing up on all sides, and that the exiled children of Judah no longer seek the land of their fathers merely to let their bones mingle with the hallowed soil. Tears of genuine sorrow and of passionate yearning still flow at the recital on the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple of elegies like those of the Castilian Jehudah Halevi :—

Zion,
Hast thou no greeting for thy prisoned sons,
That seek thy peace, the remnant of thy flock ?
I would pour forth my soul upon each spot
Where once upon thy youths God's spirit breathed :
Prostrate upon thy soil now let me fall,
Embrace thy stones, and love thy very dust !
Shall food and drink delight me when I see
Thy lions torn by dogs ? What joy to me
Shall daylight bring if with it I behold
The ravens feasting on thine eagles' flesh ?
But where thy God himself made choice to dwell
A blest abode thy children yet shall find.

If you ask me—Where are the men to come from who are to bring about this revolution, not in the career alone, but within the very hearts of a people, who are to vanquish the indifference, to purify the sordid aims, to enlarge the narrow hopes, that make up the lives of Jewish as of other Philistines, I answer, I do not know. But I know that the same question would have remained unanswered if it had been put before the stirrings of the pulses of the national idea was felt in Greece or in Italy, before the genius of a Byron or a Mazzini rekindled the extinguished hopes and ambitions of these nations.

Nor is it easy to say how this end is to be brought about. Two oaths, says a doctor of the Talmud, God imposes upon Israel [1]. First, that they shall not seek the restoration of their land by means of violence, and, next, that they will not rebel against the nations among whom they dwell. That is to say, it is not to physical force but to the growth of moral influences that we are to look for the realization of our ideals. "Not by force, nor by might, but by My spirit, saith the Lord." It is in the Jewish race itself that the breath of enthusiasm is needed without which no people ever worked out or deserved to accomplish its own regeneration. If, in contemplating the actual condition of mind of multitudes of his brethren, the believer in the destinies of Israel does not always meet with a sympathtic response, he is not dismayed or disheartened; he looks to a higher than earthly source for the vivifying impulse, and face to face with the apathy and the ridicule of the world, he prepares to fall in with the train of thought to which the poetess, who has already enlightened us on one side of

[1] Kethuboth 111a.

the Jewish character, gives utterance in the "New Ezekiel" :—

What! Can these dead bones live, whose sap is dried
By twenty scorching centuries of wrong?
Is this the House of Israel whose pride
Is as a tale that's told, an ancient song?
Are these ignoble relics all that live
Of Psalmist, priest and prophet? Can the breath
Of very heaven bid these bones revive,
Open the graves, and clothe the ribs of death?
Yea, Prophesy, the Lord hath said again:
Say to the wind, Come forth and breathe afresh,
Even that they may live, upon these slain,
And bone to bone shall leap, and flesh to flesh.
The spirit is not dead, proclaim the word.
Where lay dead bones a host of armed men stand!
I ope your graves, My people, saith the Lord,
And I shall place you living in your land.

And the other peoples of the earth, have they anything to fear from the realization of these Messianic hopes? Which of them will be losers? Will not all of them rather be gainers by the reconstitution of a community which, without abandoning either its own character or its mission, "carries the culture and sympathies of every great nation in its bosom," and which has no heart for a future of national glory apart from the glory and the welfare of mankind, apart from the aspiration to bring the whole world as a spiritual Israel nearer to Zion's God?

THE MESSIANIC IDEA IN JUDAISM

(*A Paper read before the Jews' College Literary Society, May 22nd, 1887.*)

On the day, says the Talmud (Sabbath 31a), when a man comes before the last tribunal and account is rendered by him of his life's thoughts and actions, one of the first questions put to him will be, "Hast thou watched for the promised salvation?" or, as the words might be more freely rendered, "Hast thou kept alive thy faith in a better future?"

It is not a bad test by which to try a man or a nation, or even the whole race of mankind. Do you believe that in the lapse of ages things have gone and are going from bad to worse? Do you hold with the Roman poet that

> A race of parents baser than their sires
> Gave birth to us, a progeny more vile,
> Who'll dower the world with offspring viler still?

Or do you believe, without precisely maintaining that each successive generation is in all respects an improvement upon its predecessor, that on the whole the present is better than the past, and that the future will be better than either; and are you therefore disposed to join in the admission of the English poet—

> Yet I doubt not through the ages one increasing purpose runs,
> And the thoughts of man are widened with the process of the suns?

There is more in this than a mere academic theme, started for the purpose of testing how much can be talked on either side. Upon the view taken in regard to this question depends in great measure our attitude towards God and the world, and the harmony of the soul with itself. For, given the belief that the coming ages have nought else in store for man but the struggles, the failures, the pains, the sorrows, the sins, the corruptions of the past, if not an infinite aggravation of them, then at every period he starts upon his lifework heavy-laden, bearing his sentence of condemnation with him and within him. Create and nourish the conviction that the world's saddest experiences are not destined to be perpetuated, except in the sense that they make a happier future possible; that the débris of the past is to furnish materials for the glorious edifice of the future; that the highest triumphs of Religion and Humanity, which seem unattainable to us, will be within the reach of those who shall succeed us, then the whole of mankind becomes ennobled by anticipation, while the great hope thus tenaciously clung to, will carry within itself the germs of its own fulfilment.

Now this conception is in its best and most distinctive features essentially Jewish. If the idea flashes forth also in the greatest luminary of the Augustan age, it was, there are good grounds for believing, because the sun had already risen in its full strength in the East, and its rays were caught and reflected by a Vergil. The fourth Eclogue, however, was written for the glorification not so much of the future of humanity as of a then reigning sovereign, to whom men vied with each other in paying an almost divine homage. The most cultured

of ancient nations were strangers to the hopeful feeling regarding the future that animated the heart of the Jew. A Hesiod and, following him, an Ovid conceived the ages succeeding each other in the order—golden, silver, brazen, iron—the work of degeneration going on apace. The Jew, if he would not exactly have reversed the series, would certainly have kept his golden age ahead of him. The stream of time, he felt, was not hurrying him away from it, but bearing him towards it. True, there is at the commencement of the Bible the story of man's brief sojourn in Eden, followed by his expulsion therefrom. But how slender is the influence which a "Paradise Lost" has exercised over the minds of "the People of the Book"! That incident once passed and recorded, one hears no wailing for the lost treasures of Eden; no cries for a return to its "bowers of innocence and ignorance." It is not in the childhood of mankind but in its maturity that the ideal of happiness is to be sought. Leave the first chapters of Genesis, and throughout the rest of the Bible you will not meet with a single reference to what in the language and for the purposes of sectarian theology is called "the fall of man." Indeed is not the phrase an altogether misleading one? Far truer would it be to assert that the Bible proclaims what all science teaches — the doctrine not of the fall, but of the rise of man.

The belief in the advance of the human race and the doctrine of the Messiah are but expressions of the same great truth. They are two parallel streams, whose waters ultimately unite to flow on in a more richly fertilizing flood. Upon the banks of one of these streams we are about to make a brief stay this

evening, and to indulge ourselves in a few reflections on the origin and development, the character and tendency of the Messianic idea in Judaism. The subject is one upon which there is not much hope of saying anything new. Where Schöttgen, De Wette, Gfroerer, Anger, Hausrath, Castelli, Weber, Schürer, Drummond, Hamburger, and Weiss have been at work—to mention only a few of the modern writers, who have treated of Jewish dogmatics and whose researches are open to everybody—it is not likely that any coming after will be rewarded by many new discoveries, or be able to do much more than confess his acknowledgments to some or all of these. But if the knowledge that the best things have already been said, and better said, is effectually to stop people's mouths, what a silent, lectureless world this would be!

The doctrine of a Messiah and a Messianic age did not come into existence suddenly. It did not burst upon the world as an instantaneous discovery, complete in all its parts. Great ideas require a process of time, and the favouring combination of many elements and circumstances to bring them to maturity. The Messianic doctrine was in reality an organic growth to which many generations contributed their share. Like other such growths it had its periods of more and of less rapid development; and it had its excrescences—to some of which we shall have to refer later on—which sometimes concealed and disfigured the nobler principle beneath, and drew to themselves the nutriment that ought to have fed the grand central idea.

One great difficulty meets us in endeavouring to trace the origin of this idea in the Scriptures. It is the embarrassment caused by the multitude of guides that

offer themselves and the pertinacity with which they press their services upon us. Theological bias, now in one direction, now in another, has forcibly annexed to the Messianic realm many a Scriptural passage, which must have struggled hard against the irrational union, but which, in the course of time, in consquence of a method of bold and confident reiteration, came to be regarded by the popular mind as from the very first a natural ally.

Endeavouring, however, to look at the Scriptures with our own eyes, we may ask, What has the Pentateuch to tell us on the subject ?—Nothing of a definite character. The name Messiah does not occur ; the notion of a king was foreign and to a certain extent antagonistic to the state Moses was bent on founding. Even the broad conception of a Messianic age or state is absent, and indeed would hardly have found acceptance at a period when the main object to be achieved was the establishment of an independent people, with a political and religious organization intended to keep them for a time at least apart from other races, to secure them from the danger of absorption by their neighbours. A sound criticism, backed by a desire to treat the Scriptural records with the same fairness as we would any secular volume—a combined intellectual and moral phenomenon not witnessed in every age nor always witnessed even now—forces upon us the conclusion that in none of those passages in which partisans of some religious system or other have detected forecasts of the person of the Messiah is anything of the sort to be found. "Shiloh," in Jacob's blessing, has to be separated from the person with whom it has been fancifully associated not by Christians alone

(see Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonathan, Targum Yerushalmi, Sanhed. 98b, Mid. Rab. and Yalkut in loc.), when it is seen that the word is in strict agreement with the local colouring and the limited purview marking the whole of that benediction. "The star that goes forth from Jacob and the sceptre that rises from Israel" (Onkelos and Pseudo-Jonathan, Yerushalmi Taanith iv. 8, Midrash Echa 66b, etc., notwithstanding) are defined by the very words following, "And shall smite the corners of Moab," and are most naturally referred to David or other conqueror. Nor are there any better grounds for regarding the "prophet," whom God would raise up in the midst of Israel after Moses, like unto him, as the Messiah (Acts iii. 22). Seeing that the people had just been warned against trusting to diviners and soothsayers, as the heathen around them did, because God would provide them for a prophet when their lawgiver was no more, "like unto him," the meaning evidently was, "like unto him" in authority, to whom they were to listen as they had listened to him; and it would surely have been no effective appeal to say to them, that they were not to follow after false prophets *then*, because a true one would arise in their midst centuries or millenniums later, whom they could never consult.

But although all such specific evidence must be put aside as of more than doubtful value, signs are not wanting that the germ of the idea underlying the fuller conception of a Messianic age was in existence from the time of the founders of the race of Israel. "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed," was the promise given both to Abraham and to Isaac. It was a promise that reached far beyond the lifetime of

each, farther than the limits of the temporal kingdom their descendants founded; that has obtained but partial fulfilment up to our time, and looks for fullest realization to that future towards which each of us in his measure may contribute his share. In the midst of the gloomy picture drawn in Leviticus xxvi., of the disasters that were in store for an unfaithful Israel, rays of a brighter time broke through. God would remember His covenant with the fathers; He would remember the land: when they were in the land of their enemies He would not cast His people off, nor consume them—He would remain their God. And similarly, when the sun was about to set upon the life of the Lawgiver, and he was gathering all his strength to render his people the last, and perhaps most memorable service, he bade them be of good hope, for that when bitter trouble had brought true repentance, God would again gather them from all the nations whither He had driven them. "If any of those driven out from among thee be at the outmost parts under Heaven, from thence will the Lord gather thee; and He will bring thee unto the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it, and He will do thee good and multiply thee above thy fathers" (Deut. xxx). That this prediction was not fulfilled, in the return of a fraction of the exiles from Babylon, that a dispersion anticipated in the words "thy outcasts at the outmost parts under Heaven" was far more extensive than had occurred during the first exile, need hardly be pointed out. It was to a more distant future that the Prophet now looked, and by his example he endeavoured to accustom his people to the contemplation of an idea which, even in its dim and imperfect form, was calculated to exercise

an elevating and inspiring effect upon those who cherished it.

With the close of the career of the Lawgiver the idea seems to have withdrawn into the background. If not entirely forgotten, it ceased to operate in the formation of the national character. It is not difficult to account for this. Those were the days of Israel's great struggle for existence. There was enough to do to get and to hold possession of the land for which they had set forth in high and triumphant hope. The task was more arduous and took longer than they had anticipated. A time ensued when all national affairs were unsettled. Each tribe fought for its own hand. There was no king, no central authority in Israel. The political uncertainty and confusion were reflected in the religious life of the people. "The word of God was rare in those days." Amid the din and turmoil of almost unceasing warfare, what chance had a Prophet's voice of making itself heard? If the nobler minds to be met with in every age, however degenerate, still cherished the patriarchal hopes for Israel's destiny, the utterance of those hopes has not been preserved to our day; and judging from the general character of that period, they found no place in the national consciousness.

By the time of David a radical change had taken place in the character of the nation. They may be said to have passed through the wild unsettled period of youth, and to have emerged into a manhood that recognized its own dignity, its duties, and its prospects. Here we reach a further stage in the formation of the great hope. It is based now upon the house and kingdom of David, and this element henceforth enters

largely into the conception of the Messianic age. The reign of David was distinguished by an unprecedented material and moral progress. But there was a yearning for something more and higher and more lasting. Accordingly special promises were received by David touching the establishment of his dynasty and the peaceful stability of the nation. The prophet Nathan brings him the assurance that God would appoint a place for His people, and plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own, whence they shall move no more, and where children of wickedness shall not again afflict; while as for David himself, "thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee, thy throne shall be established for ever" (2 Sam. vii. 10, 16).

So rooted had this conviction become in the heart of the Psalmist-King, that towards the end of his life he put it on grateful record that God "magnifieth the salvation of His King, and sheweth mercy to His anointed, to David and his seed for ever" (Psalm xviii. 50); almost his last testament to his son was an exhortation to remember the divine promise made to him: "If thy children take heed to their way, to walk before Me in truth with all their heart and with all their soul, there shall not fail thee a man on the throne of Israel" (1. Kings ii. 4). If we may trust the superscription of Psalm lxviii, as well as the internal evidence,—both of which point to David as the author—his hopes were not limited to the future of his own race and family. He had wilder views. "Princes shall come out of Egypt, Ethiopia shall quickly stretch out her hands unto God. Ye kingdoms of the earth, sing unto God, sing praises unto the Lord." In another Psalm (xcvi.),

the authorship of which is hardly open to dispute (comp. 1 Chron. xvi. 23–33), the same sentiment prevails, but is more strongly emphasized. The Lord is represented as the righteous and truthful judge of all the earth; the families of nations are summoned to ascribe glory and strength unto Him, the whole universe participates in the joy at His coming. It was a prophetic glance, clear and confident into the far future, for his own experiences gave the Psalmist no grounds to expect such a result in his own lifetime. He saw the brighter age ahead of him, and left his message of hope as a heritage for his fellow-men. (See this part of our subject admirably treated in Weiss *Dor Dor Vedorshav*, Book I.)

These ideas underwent a further development in the reign of Solomon. They grew especially in the direction of a universal hope. Israel's function was, according to him, not to monopolize, but to lead the praises of God. At the dedication of his Temple, he entreats the Most High to give ear from His heavenly habitation to the prayer of the Gentile who is not of His people Israel, and to do according to all that he prays for. And why? "In order that all the nations of the earth might know Thy name, 'to fear Thee' like Thy people Israel" (1 Kings viii. 43). In his measure he was privileged to advance the very end he had in view. The admiration excited by his wisdom was at times transferred to the source whence it was derived. People heard of the fame of Solomon, and through that also "concerning the name of the Lord." (*Ibid.* x. 1).

And such was the exalted level of prosperity and glory, both material and moral, that had been reached during the first period of his rule, that the poets of

that time took his reign as a model on which they founded some of the noblest conceptions of an age Messianic in all but the name.

The 72nd Psalm is a relic of that period. It speaks of a King, such as had never yet been seen on earth. Solomon may have suggested the description; he never could realize it in his own person. It meant another—to appear in the fulness of time. "He shall judge Thy people with righteousness, and Thy poor with judgment; he shall break in pieces the oppressor. So that men shall fear Thee so long as sun and moon endure. In his days shall the righteous flourish, and abundance of peace so long as the moon endureth. All things shall bow down to him, all nations serve him. He is to redeem man's soul from deceit and violence, to save the souls of the afflicted. Prayer shall be made for him continually. His name shall endure for ever; men shall be blessed in him, while all nations shall call him blessed."

For a considerable time after the reign of Solomon the clue to Messianic hope is lost. It is not easy to account for this. That was the time when the Schools of the Prophets flourished and produced many a worthy champion of the divine cause; we should expect such men as these not to be silent on a subject that must have filled their minds in proportion to the moral and spiritual degeneracy by which they were surrounded, and against which they kept up a life-long struggle. Some have accounted for their silence by the very nature of that struggle. They were engaged in an active contest with present evils. "Prophetism stood opposed to idolatry and despotism and anarchy. Men who instigated revolts and deposed kings and brought about

reforms by direct and practical measures were more concerned with deeds than with words, and have consequently left but slight literary remains of their work." (Adeney's *Study of Messianic Prophecy*, p. 189). Perhaps the more natural explanation would be, that we have no full record of the prophetic utterances of those times, and that much that would have been of interest and value has been lost. It should be remembered that the Bible, covering as it does a space of some 1,000 years, is not a full and exhaustive account of all that was said and done during that period. There are prophets of whom only a few sentences have come down to us; and even those, of whose speeches we possess a more abundant record, can hardly have compressed the literary tokens of their activity into a few score chapters. It is reasonable then to suppose that the Messianic hope, in a more or less definite form, was not unknown to those early witnesses to God's truth, but that in the vicissitudes, to which the books as well as the lives of men are subject, much that would have profited us greatly to possess has been irrecoverably lost. It is certain, however, that when once the idea reappears, it has grown in strength and depth and clearness, much as happens with certain rivers which at some point in their course dive into the earth and disappear from view, to emerge at a distance, swollen by unseen tributaries, and purified in their untraceable passage.

Gathering up the various expressions found in the inspired writers, the principal features of the Messianic age in its developed form would be these: The physical world has undergone a complete regeneration; the perpetual strife now visible in nature is stilled; want and disease are unknown; long life is the universal

gift. The social transformation is not less complete. War is no longer practised or learnt. Weapons of destruction are broken in pieces, or converted into instruments of utility. Under a king, descended from David, ruling with equity and in the Spirit of the Lord, divinely aided and directed, Israel forms a nation once more in his own land and city ; but the lines of demarcation between him and the Gentiles become almost obliterated in the growth of a larger spiritual Israel grouped around or grafted upon God's people. It is in spiritual treasures that the age is richest. A hunger and thirst to hear God's word has seized upon all men ; a knowledge of the Most High is their inalienable privilege. God's Spirit is poured out on all flesh. Harmony is at length evolved out of the conflicting voices that have so long resounded under heaven, and with one language and accord the whole family of man joins in the worship of the One God.

In many of the prophecies these bright colours are mingled, and as it seems to us somewhat blurred by descriptions of the judgment to be executed upon the heathen and the obdurate enemies of God. The speakers probably found it difficult to imagine how all those glorious ends to which they pointed were to be brought about, so long as the triumph remained unchecked of those who seemed to live only in order to thwart them. These conceptions are of course not present in every detail in any one prophet. They are the general impression produced by the collective body of Messianic prophecies. Each prophet, receiving within him the divine light, reflected it, tinged in a manner by his own predominant hue.

We may briefly glance at some of the specific utter-

ances of these inspired messengers. As regards the period with which they deal the earliest of the prophetic books, strictly so called, are Jonah and Joel. In Jonah there are of course no Messianic prophecies. But the whole subject matter of the book—the demonstration of the divine love for erring Gentiles, their restitution to the divine favour, and the employment of an Israelitish Prophet in a work which is based upon the idea of the universal fatherhood of God—is a remarkable anticipation of the Messianic principle in its most developed form. Joel deals in the first part of his book with a great disaster that had overtaken the land. It had been visited by a plague of locusts. The calamity suggests to him words of exhortation and warning. These, however, pass over to a more hopeful form of address. The bodily needs of his people, he promises, shall be abundantly supplied. But there are higher wants which have to be satisfied. The transition is very striking. "Ye shall eat and be satisfied, and praise the name of the Lord that hath dealt wondrously with you, and My people shall not be put to shame for ever. And it shall come to pass after that, I will pour out My spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions, and also upon the servants and the handmaids in those days will I pour My spirit." Then follows a description of certain terrifying signs and potents; after which the restoration of the captivity of Judah and Jerusalem is to take place, and judgment to be executed upon the nations in the Valley of Jehoshaphat—perhaps a symbolic expression for the place where, as the name implies, "the Lord will judge."

Two of the characteristics of the Messianic age in its maturest conception are lacking in this prophet—the establishment of the throne of David as the centre of the regenerated world, and the extension to the Gentile of the blessings of the new era. They are supplied by succeeding prophets, who often go over and grave more deeply the lineaments drawn by their predecessors. "After many days," says Hosea (iii. 4), "the children of Israel shall return and seek the Lord their God and David their King." Micah (v. 1) points to Bethlehem, the birthplace of David, as the spot from which the Messiah shall spring. Zechariah (ix. 9, 10) sees him coming as a just and helpful King, a messenger of peace, riding not upon a battle-steed, but on the unwarlike ass. "He shall speak peace unto the nations, and his dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth." Isaiah (xi.) declares him distinctly to be "a rod from the stem Jesse, and a branch sprung from his roots." Endowed with marvellous gifts, he shall employ them righteously and faithfully. All angry passions shall be calmed, violence come to an end. "They shall no longer hurt and destroy in all my holy mountain."

Not contenting himself with generalities or a vague and nebulous enthusiasm for humanity—an interesting but sometimes a very cheap sentiment—this great prophet was not afraid to run counter to the prejudices of his time, and must have astounded some of his countrymen not a little by the breadth and boldness of his doctrine. He and his contemporary Micah are among the first Prophets who proclaim in unequivocal language that the coming blessedness is not to be the exclusive heritage of their listeners and friends. The

northern Kingdom of Israel, notwithstanding its more serious lapse from God, and—what implies a still loftier spirit of toleration on the part of the Prophet—notwithstanding the bitter hostility that had so long marked the relations of Israel with their brethren of Judah in the South, is to be restored (Isa. xi.) in company with them. He would assemble the outcasts of Israel and gather the dispersed of Judah, and then Ephraim shall no more envy Judah nor Judah vex Ephraim. Nay more, those whom they had been accustomed to regard as their natural enemies, Egypt and Assyria, between which two rival states Judea lay, and from both of whom she suffered according as one or the other was in the ascendant—even these were to be included in the great redemption of the future. "In that day there shall be a highway out of Egypt and Assyria, and the Egyptians shall worship with the Assyrians. In that day shall Israel be a third with Egypt and with Assyria, even a blessing in the midst of the land; whom the Lord of hosts shall bless, saying, Blessed be Egypt and Assyria, the work of My hands, and Israel Mine inheritance." Isaiah xix. 23–25.

It required no little courage on the part of men to prophesy in this strain, as next to speaking unpleasant things to people about themselves, there is nothing that so much irritates them as speaking pleasant things of their enemies. But these men were not hunters after popularity; they were seekers after truth; and the wider and deeper the spring of truth they found and opened to the world, the better they liked it. Theirs was the privilege not only to look far beyond their own time, but to see clearly what could scarcely shape

itself in others' thoughts. All the families of man were to be heirs of the glorious time they anticipated. "It shall come to pass in the last days that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many nations shall set forth and say, Come let us go up to the mountain of the Lord and to the house of the God of Jacob, and He will teach us of His ways and we will walk in His paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the Law and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." He is to be the Judge among the nations. The reign of justice will supersede the fierce arbitrament of war; and the weapons designed for mutual slaughter will be converted into instruments for the benefit of man. With the suppression of the brute element in human nature, the noble qualities will have freer play; the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the bed of the sea. The root of Jesse, still surviving by the fostering care of God, shall stand as an ensign to the peoples; to him shall the nations resort, and his rest shall be glorious (Isa. ii. and xi., Mic. iv.).

This universalistic spirit belongs in an eminent degree to the prophets who lived during and after the exile. It would not have been surprising had the iron entered into their soul, and their conceptions of the great future been tinged by strong national prejudices and antipathies. But it is just these men in whom the spirit of humanity burned most brightly, and from whose theological creed all that was narrow and exclusive was absent. They yearned for something grander than a mere national restoration. The sufferings of their own people, instead of contracting their sympathies, as it

is apt to do in meaner natures, opened their hearts to the wants of all men. Thus, in the new distribution of the land which Ezekiel foresaw, the strangers and their children have a share (xlvii. 22, 23); and under the figure of a cedar tree planted in the mountain height of Israel, spreading its branches abroad and affording shelter to all the birds of heaven, the prophet foreshadows the ingathering under the divine protection of all the races of mankind (xvii. 22, 23). "Many nations," says Zechariah (ii. 11), "shall be joined to the Lord in that day and shall be My people." "Yea many people and strong nations shall come to seek the Lord of hosts in Jerusalem and to pray before the Lord." In the writings of the great unknown prophet who lived at the time of the exile, these thoughts are met with in extraordinary profusion. There we read of one to whom it is said that "it is but a light thing that thou shouldst be My servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be My salvation to the ends of the earth." (Isa. xlix. 6). There too we read of "the sons of the stranger that join themselves to the Lord, to serve Him and to love His name," to whom the divine promise is extended, "I will bring them to My holy mountain and make them joyful in My house of prayer; their burnt offerings and their sacrifices shall be accepted upon Mine altar; for Mine house shall be called an house of prayer for all the nations" (Isa. lvi. 6, 7).

These and similar prophecies formed the storehouse from which later ages drew their inspirations; using always the same materials, though now one and now another element might predominate; combining them

in various ways, expanding and elaborating them; sometimes adorning, sometimes defacing them; most frequently welding them into forms corresponding strictly to the politico-religious sentiment of the time. I regret that the limits of this lecture forbid me to even glance at the writings of Philo or at the mass of apocryphal and apocalyptic literature dealing with our subject. All this is sufficiently important in itself to demand separate and careful treatment, which I trust to be able to give it on a future occasion. For the present we must content ourselves with inquiring how the Messianic idea is conceived in those writings which, next to the Scriptures, have had the greatest influence in the formation and development of Jewish doctrine.

The Messianic Kingdom is, as I understand the prevailing Rabbinical view, an earthly state, purified from the dross and the evil that cling to all earthly things in their present condition. The scene of action is this world in which we live; the actors men and women, who have established the sovereignty of their higher over their lower natures. The time is placed in the indefinite future; but it precedes the *Olam ha-ba*, "the World to come," which belongs to a totally different class of conceptions. In making this statement I am perhaps doing a bold thing. In an erudite article on the Talmud, which appeared in the *Westminster Review* of January, 1885, our friend, Mr. Schechter, remarked: "What exact relation the terms 'the World to come,' 'the Kingdom of Heaven,' and 'the days of the Messiah,' bear to each other, in what order they follow and in what places they shall be experienced, are all questions which have been variously

disputed by Jewish scholars, without any very satisfactory result having as yet been obtained."—It is true there are authorities that can be quoted to prove that the Messianic age belongs to this world, to the interval between this and the next, to the beginning of the next, and finally that it is identical with the next. But the prevailing conception in Jewish theology is that the Messianic age is to precede the "World to come." All the Prophets have but prophesied concerning the days of the Messiah; but as to the "World to come," no eye but thine, O God, hath seen what Thou wilt do for him that waiteth for Thee. (Sabbath 63a).

And as the kingdom is an exalted earthly one, with human beings in a more perfect condition than those with whom we are acquainted, so the King of this regenerated realm will be a mortal endowed with transcendant attributes. Perhaps it was the polemic spirit roused by the pretensions of the newly-risen creed that was the cause of the saying recorded in Taanith (21): If a man says, "I am God," he lies; if he says "I am the son of God," he will regret it; if he says "I shall rise to heaven," he will not fulfil it.—In a celebrated dialogue which Justin Martyr held with the Jew Tryphon (see p. 263 below), he makes the Jew express the opinion: We all expect that the Messiah will come into being as a man from among men (Dial. ch. 49). It is to my mind the loftiest idea in the whole doctrine that it is this earth which is to be the scene of a better state of things, and that through human agencies, divinely helped and guided though they be, the Messianic glories are to be achieved.

But though the vision of the brighter future is clear, and the hope that it would be reached unfaltering, it

was felt that many a stormy sea would have to be crossed before the blissful haven could be entered. Evil was an active, ever present force ; it gave no signs of diminution, rather it grew and spread ; and how was that state of material and moral perfection to be attained while suffering and sin were darkening men's lives, and experience mocked their most ardent beliefs ? There was a double source of evil to be dealt with—one from without, another from within. In the discussion of this side of our subject it must be confessed that the spirit of pessimism rules for the most part. The enemies of Israel and of God do not give up their hostility, and destruction awaits them. There is something profoundly terrifying in the pictures drawn of the slaughter of the foes in the Targumim and the Talmud. If I do not dwell on these scenes or deal with the strange figure of Armilus—the Anti-Christ of Jewish legend, the representative (Romulus ?) of the arch-enemy of Israel, or the ἐρημόλαος or people-devourer (as *Balaam* was connected with *bila-am*), the personification of the last surviving powers of evil—it is because any one who follows up these conceptions must perceive how greatly they were coloured by the embittered experiences of the writers. They had not yet reached that stage in religious philosophy which enables men to conceive the cause of the righteous being established without involving the destruction of their persecutors. Are we sure that *we* have got much beyond the theory or the sentiment expressed in these words ? How seldom do we witness the establishment of a righteous cause without a struggle that carries with it the destruction of its adversaries ! Does not liberty grow upon a soil often saturated with the blood of tyrants, and is not

truth itself made triumphant in the defeat and discomfiture of the champions of falsehood ?—But gentler and more tolerant views had their advocates as well. In the days of the Messiah, we read in Abodah Zarah (24b), all the heathens will of their own accord seek to become proselytes. According to Sifre (76b), every one will long to have a dwelling in the Land of Israel, as the great and mighty of the nations now give themselves no rest until they have a palace of their own in Rome. The Messiah, says Shir rabba 24a, with a play upon the word *Chadrakh* in Zechariah ix. 1, is called by this name because he leads all the nations of the world in repentance before the Holy One.

It is, however, in anticipations of every kind of calamity and the last extremes of misfortune, as well as of the utter corruption and degeneracy of Israel and the world, all which events are to precede the advent of Messiah, that one perceives how deep a gloom oppressed at times the most hopeful spirits. The conviction rooted itself and spread abroad that things would be much worse before they would take a turn for the better. Messiah will not see the light of day before the *Cheble ham-Mashiach*, the pangs of the Messianic birth, have been endured. It is noteworthy that while the apocalyptic literature, when treating of those far-off times, dwells by preference upon dread signs and portents in nature,—such as earthquakes and conflagrations, the sun shining by night and the moon by day, blood dropping from wood, and stones giving forth a voice, swords drawn across the heavens, and troops of soldiers marching through the clouds—the rabbinical writings, emphasize rather such sorrowful signs as the decadence and confusion of

all principles and a deep and wide-spread depravity. All social and moral bonds are snapped asunder. "At the heels, or in the foot-prints of Messiah, Insolence will be triumphant and Pride prevail. The vine will give its fruits, yet wine will be dear (there will be many drunkards). The governing powers will turn themselves to heresy. There will be no reproof. The house of assembly (the synagogue) will be used for vile purposes. Galilee will be destroyed, and Gablan laid waste, and the men of Gebul wander from city to city, and find no favour. The wisdom of the scribes will be abhorred, and those who fear sin despised, and truth will fail. Boys will make the colour come and go in the faces of old men. The old will rise up before the young. The son puts the father to shame, the daughter rises against her mother, the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law. The enemies of a man are the members of his own household. The face of that generation is like the face of the dog. Whom have we then on whom to rely? Our Father who is in Heaven!" (Sotah ix. 15, and Sanhed. 97a). In a similar strain the following is conceived. "Judges will cease in Irsael; traitors will multiply, and students of the law diminish; universal poverty will prevail, and the redemption be despaired of: then the son of David will come. In the generation in which the son of David comes the disciples of the wise shall diminish, and as to others, their eyes shall fail them by reason of sorrow and groaning. Many evils and cruel decrees will be renewed. While the first is being appointed, the second hasteneth to come." (*Ibid.*).

But gloomy as these forebodings were, those who uttered them never meant by such language to preach

the Gospel of despair. It served as the dark background that threw up but the more brightly the radiant figure of Messiah.—"Seest thou an age pining and dwindling away—hope for *him*, for so it is written (2 Sam. xxii. 28): 'An afflicted people Thou wilt save.' Seest thou a generation whom many troubles overwhelm as a flood, hope for *him*, for so it is written (Isa. lix. 19, 20): 'When the enemy shall come in like a flood, the spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him, and the Redeemer shall come unto Zion'" (Sanhed. 98a). Still more emphatic is the declaration of faith in Shir Rab. (on Canticles ii. 13): "If thou seest generation after generation reviling and blaspheming, look then for traces of the Messiah, for so it is said (Ps. lxxxix. 51): 'Remember, Lord, the revilings wherewith thine enemies have reviled the steps of thine anointed,' following immediately upon which it is said: 'Blessed be the Lord for ever and ever'" (52). All these passages go but to show that though their authors knew something of the evil side of human nature and were prepared for even worse than they knew, they did not allow the issue of the great struggle between hope and fear, that has to be fought out in every human breast, to remain long in doubt for them. To their thinking also, "When need is highest, then aid is nighest." God had not abdicated; and the conviction dominated their souls, that His over-ruling Providence must ultimately subdue all men and things to His own beneficent plan.

Somewhat akin to this branch of our subject, which deals with the misfortunes that are to precede the Messianic age, is the question whether the conception of the Messiah himself as a sufferer has any true and

permanent foundation in Judaism. We know how enormous a superstructure has been built upon it. That the idea is to be met with in a few out-of-the-way places in Judaism, is not to be denied. Very stirring is the story to be found in Yalkut on Isaiah and in the Pesikta (37) of the pains Messiah takes upon himself; his anxiety to learn how long they are to last; his acceptance of them, provided God would, in consideration thereof, spare His people, both those that have been and those that shall be born. Very startling, too, it is to read of the heavy iron beam placed upon his neck, beneath which he bends and groans, pleading for some regard for his weakness—he is but flesh and blood —and of God's assuring him that He too suffers in the misfortunes of His people; and then of Messiah's reply, that he is content, for that the servant may well fare like the Master. All this is interesting enough, if not very intelligible. How is it to be accounted for?

The whole theory is based upon an uncritical treatment of Isaiah liii. Grant that this chapter is Messianic, and it becomes necessary to reconcile it with the accounts everywhere else to be met with, which represent the Redeemer as exalted and triumphant throughout. A polemical device accordingly created a Messiah, son of Joseph, or of Ephraim, who was to suffer in the manner we have seen; to head the war against Gog and Magog—types of the brute forces arrayed against the righteous in the distant future, and even to perish in that war; and who was to be succeeded by Messiah son of David, to whom the kingdom should belong.

Now I do not conceive it our duty to defend everything that has been written by Jews in the Hebrew, or Aramaic, or any other tongue. I suppose the literature

of a people has to swallow its proverbial peck of dust, just like any mother's son among us, in this dusty world of ours. We are commanded to distinguish between the clean and the unclean, between the holy and the unholy; and that is a duty which assuredly should not be limited to what enters our *mouths*. Not all is gold that glitters, even in the Talmud. Many a pretty tale may make bad theology. It would therefore be well to reject, as un-Jewish, whatever confuses the personality, or dims the glory of Messiah.

Be it observed especially, that it is not so much the idea of the anointed of the Lord having to make experience of sorrow, that is opposed to Judaism, as that his sorrow is to be the atonement for the sins of those whom he is to deliver. To the formation of the highest type of character some acquaintance with grief is necessary: but that God should bargain for the agonies of one man as a compensation for the sins of all other men, is no less opposed to Judaism than it is revolting to the dictates of uncorrupted reason. We may therefore pass by the doctrine of a suffering Messiah and of a Messiah son of Joseph, as the offspring of that mystical school, in which the union of intense religious enthusiasm with a defective judgment was productive of results involving at times no little danger to that very religion it meant to honour and exalt.

In this same mystical school originated also the doctrines of the pre-existence and concealment of Messiah. Pesachim, 54a, includes his name among the seven things created before the world was called into being. (See also Beresh. Rab. I., Pirké 'd R. Eliezer 3, and the Targum on Is. ix. 5.) Probably nothing more was meant than that the Messiah had a place in the original

scheme of God for the welfare of the beings He was about to create. Glancing with the eye of omniscience into the most distant future, He perceived what would be the crowning need of humanity, and provided for it. Other writers went further than this, and conceived him as being actually in existence from the creation of the world (Mid. Proverbs 67c), as living in Paradise with Elijah even to the present day (Kolbo 237a and Abodath Hakkodesch 43), weeping over the deferred hopes of Israel, and being visited, now by the patriarchs and other holy men, who seek to comfort him in the delayed fulfilment of his mission, now by sinners like Korah and his companions, who anxiously inquire when the hoped-for deliverance to be effected through him is to take place. The uncritical knowledge, that so long prevailed, of the Bible may have laid the foundation for these and other vagaries. There was the remark of Micah regarding the ruler who was to spring from Bethlehem (chap. v. 1), which of course only meant that his descent should be a very ancient one. There was the vision in Daniel vii. 17, equally misunderstood,—concerning a son of man who comes with the clouds of heaven—clearly representing Israel in contrast to the beasts who figure for the other earthly powers. These would provide a starting point on the road of error, along which it is always easier to advance than to retrace one's steps. Indeed the misconceptions to which Daniel gave rise are traceable already in the apocalyptic literature, both pre- and post-Christian, notably in the book of Enoch and 4th Ezra. There is, however, more than one sense in which the pre-existence of the Messiah may be more readily admitted. On the hypothesis—a favourite one in rabbinical litera-

ture (to which Friedmann on Pesikta 37 draws attention) —that the souls of all men were called into being before the creation of Adam, and that each was from the first destined to inhabit a certain body, the union taking place at birth, one can conceive how Messiah also had a premundane existence. One is reminded how the gulf that divides rabbinical from English literature is bridged by a common philosophy older than either :

> Our birth is but a sleep and a forgetting :
> The soul that rises with us, our life's star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting,
> And cometh from afar :
> Not in entire forgetfulness,
> And not in utter nakedness,
> But trailing clouds of glory do we come
> From God, who is our home.

Or we may say : in the benign purposes of God, Messiah lives from of old. God would not be what He is, were it otherwise. We go our way, unconscious of the ripening seed beneath our feet ; we pursue our narrow aims, ignorant of the consequences to which they may lead. Meanwhile the Guardian of Israel relaxes not His watchfulness, His eye penetrating to the end of all generations, and His almighty hand shaping all things to His own ends. This thought you may see finely expressed in the Midrash (Ber. Rab. 85) on the passage, " and Judah went down to Adullam." " Judah was occupied in taking unto himself a wife ; the Holy One, blessed be He, was occupied in creating the light of King Messiah. And thus it happened that before the birth of Israel's first persecutor (Pharaoh), his last deliverer was born "—that is to say, the descendant of Judah, to whom the task of the final redemption was assigned,

existed potentially from the time of Judah's marriage. He who can produce the clean even from the unclean, predetermined this.

It is of course not to be supposed that all Jews idealized these conceptions in the way just indicated. We must not blame them too severely when we bear in mind that there are still people to be found to whom words do not suggest ideas, to whom they stand in the place of things. A Messiah, who was long ago called into being, must be somewhere. He lived, it was thought, in concealment until the hour for his earthly mission should strike. The Targum on Micah iv. 8 runs, " Thou Messiah of Israel, who art concealed on account of the offences of the congregation of Zion, to thee the kingdom shall come." It was even said that like Moses, he would come, disappear, and come again (Pesikta 49a). Some thought he would proceed from the North (Vayikra Rab. 9), the north being the unknown and unexplored region to the ancient Jews. But the prevalent belief was that Rome would be his hiding-place until the day when he would manifest himself to the world. As Moses grew up in Pharaoh's house, without the king knowing that he was harbouring the future avenger of Israel, so will the Messiah, who is to execute vengeance on Edom (the Roman Empire), live in the capital of that realm, unnoticed and unsuspected (Shemoth Rab.1). R. Joshua ben Levi meets Elijah and says to him, " When comes the Messiah ? " The prophet answers, " Go and ask himself." " And where is he ? " " At the gate of the city of Rome." " And what is his sign, how can he be recognized ? " " He sits among the poor who are suffering from sickness ; all these people open and at once bind up again the bandages on their wounds. He,

however, binds up one at a time, saying, Perhaps there may be need for me (suddenly), and I shall cause no delay" (Sanhed. 98 a).

But one of the most mysterious of the many legends in connexion with the Messiah is the following, to be found in Talmud Yerushalmi, Berachoth II. 4, and with slight variations in Midrash Echa, I. 16.

A man was engaged in ploughing, when one of his oxen bellowed. An Arab was passing, and, hearing the oxen bellow, said, "Son of a Jew, loose thy oxen and loose thy ploughs, for the Temple is laid waste." The ox bellowed a second time. The Arab said to him, "Yoke thy oxen and fit thy ploughs; for King Messiah has just been born." "But," said the Jew, "what is his name?" "Menachem," replied the Arab. "And his father's name?" "Chizkijah." "And where do they dwell?" "In the palace of the King of Bethlehem—Judah." Away he went and sold his oxen, and became a seller of infants' swaddling clothes. And he passed from town to town until he came to that place. There all the women bought of him, but the mother of Menachem bought nothing. He heard the voice of the women saying, "O thou mother of Menachem! O thou mother of Menachem! Come and buy bargains for thy son." But she replied, "I would rather strangle the enemy of Israel, because on the day that he was born the Temple was laid waste." He said to her, "But we trust in the Lord of the Universe, that as it was laid waste at his feet, so at his feet it will soon be rebuilt." She said, "I have no money." To whom he replied, "What matters it? Buy bargains for him, and if you have no money to-day, after some days I will come back and

receive it." After some days he returned to the place and said to her, "How is the child doing?" And she replied, "After the time you saw me last, winds and tempests came and snatched him away from me." (See the legend translated in Drummond's *Jewish Messiah* p. 279).

One essentially Jewish feature ought to be noticed in this legend, and that is, that the Messiah was born at the very time when the Temple was destroyed. It is another form of the old and beautiful doctrine, that God never inflicts a wound without first providing a remedy. Here also the heaviest blow levelled against Israel, of incalculable consequences to them and to the world, is neutralized by the production of one who is to be the restorer of all things.

One is inevitably struck also with the peculiar likeness between this quaint story and certain events related of one for whom the Messiahship is claimed on grounds that are unsatisfactory to thinking Israelites. How comes such a tale to find a place in Jewish writings? Is it perhaps the remnant of an original bit of folklore, from which others borrowed and which they adapted to their own purposes? Or was it, as has been suggested, also in regard to a few other startling passages in the Yalkut and Pesikta, the work of people who had already gone half the road toward Christianity? Or, if I may hazard the explanation—Was it a mere parody of current beliefs and designed to show how little there was in them? I am persuaded that many a startling Midrash can be accounted for on this hypothesis. The Rabbins had a delicious caustic humour of their own; they could hit off the follies of their time without always making

proclamation of their intention to shoot ; and, like good story-tellers, they managed to keep their countenances when they gravely said things which made the over-simple open their eyes and the over-clever shake their head. That the strange tale I have quoted was the result of a predilection on their part " ridentem dicere verum," seems not unlikely from the remark it instantly called forth. R. Abun said, " What need is there for us to learn this from an Arab ? Is there not a plain Scripture that teaches the same lesson ? The 10th chapter of Isáiah ends with the words, ' And Lebanon shall fall by a mighty one.' The 11th begins,' But a rod shall come forth from the stem of Jesse, and a branch grow from his roots.' "

I can make no more than a passing reference to the theory that finds especial favour with the neologian school—the theory of a Messianic state without a Messiah. It is sometimes felt that a higher homage is paid to the future of humanity by omitting the central figure from the conception of the Messianic age. The gain is a doubtful one, at the best. A chief with exalted attributes, such as we have seen assigned to him, is not a disturbing element in a conception of an ideal state of society ; he is, in truth, its necessary complement. Certainly, there is very little in the history of the doctrine, as it has been developed in Judaism, to justify any modern follower of our faith in banishing Messiah the King from the Messianic Kingdom. When R. Hillel (Sanhed. 98b and 99a) expressed the view that there was no Messiah in store for Israel, for that they had already enjoyed him in the days of King Hezekiah, R. Joseph answered, " May God forgive R. Hillel ! When did Hezekiah live ? In the time of the first Temple. But

Zechariah, who foretold the Messiah's coming, lived in the time of the second Temple."

The transformation in the physical and moral condition of the world, that is to form a principal feature in the new era, leads to the question, put with more or less timidity, What will become of the Torah in the days of the Messiah? The characters of men having undergone a complete change, will the Law be abolished and another substituted, will it be modified, or will it be retained in its original integrity? I venture to think that this, though a very tempting topic of discussion, is not a very profitable one. When the golden age has come for all mankind, those who will be privileged to live in it will have no difficulty in deciding to what extent the authority of the Torah has survived.

It is, however, not surprising that this question has engaged the attention of Jewish thinkers. It may perhaps be regarded as the Jewish mode of treating the great ethical problem, whether the foundation of morals is absolute and eternal, or conditional and temporary. A passage here and there seems to speak of a new Law in the Messianic age. So Yalkut Isaiah 296, "the Holy one, blessed be He, will sit and expound the new Law which He will give by the hands of Messiah." But an examination of the passage shows that the reference is not to the Messianic age, but to the next life, of the laws of which we of course can know nothing. Generally speaking, the expression *torah chadashah* has the meaning not of a new law, but of a renewed law —one that receives new life, owing to the method in which it is studied and applied—in strict agreement with the "new law" promised in Jeremiah xxi. 30, 31, which is immediately explained to mean "not like

the one I gave to their fathers, which my law they brake; but I will write my law in their heart, etc.," *torah chadashah heeno chiddush torah*, says Vayikra Rab. (13). A "new law" means the "renewal of the old law." In Midrash Shir Hashirim ii. 13 occurs a passage, a different and perhaps an earlier reading of Sanhedrin 97a, which relates how the seven years immediately preceding the advent of Messiah will be spent. "The Law becomes new once more; renews itself to Israel." The immutability of the Law was a principle strongly insisted upon in view of a well-known weakness of human nature. Admit that the Messianic era is to be signalized by the suspension of any religious ordinance, and the tendency will show itself to anticipate the age, at least in so far as it can be done by the easy method of violating or neglecting the Law; while, if the occasion arose when a Messiah seemed about to appear—not a rare event in Jewish history—then indeed the temptation would be well-nigh irresistible to relax all moral and religious ties, and to make Religion itself an excuse for licence and irreligion.

The chief question, however, that occupied men's minds was always, When would he come? The longing to lift the veil that shrouds the future becomes intensified when present trouble presses heavily upon the heart. Every dark and enigmatic utterance was made to give up its secret, and to answer questions in the terms and in the spirit of the inquirer. The fancy of interpreters ran riot in seeking for hints as to the hoped-for day, and in finding them too in verses never intended to be put to so unnatural a use, or in words whose letters were believed to conceal, under the forms of an artificial system of later introduction, exact information as to

the time of the expected advent of Messiah. Hence those innumerable and conflicting calculations of the great day, which alternately roused the credulous to the highest pitch of enthusiasm and plunged them into the lowest depths of despair. It was a sort of game of scriptural hide-and-seek, pardonable perhaps in the age of the chilhood of faith, but none the less fraught with serious consequences both to the characters of the players and to the dignity of the Religion which, through the use of such methods, became the subject of a more or less ingenious sport.

What Christianity owes to a totally mistaken interpretation of Daniel's Weeks is well-known, and is now admitted by theologians not of the Jewish Church alone. In Gemara Sanhedrin 97a and Abodah Zarah 9b, we have various estimates of the date of Messiah's coming. One view very generally favoured—partly perhaps because it removed the end to a safe distance—was that the present state of things would last 6,000 years, and that the next 1,000 years would be the time of deliverance ; just as there is one year of release in every seven years, and one day of rest in every seven. The Sabbath Psalm is to be sung on " that day," which is to be an unbroken Sabbath, and one day with God is equal to 1,000 years, according to the verse " for a thousand years are in Thy sight as yesterday " (Ps. xc. 15). In the School of Eliahu it was taught that the period of 6,000 years was divided into three equal parts : the first 2,000 years were passed in moral chaos *tohu* ; the next 2,000, commencing from the call of Abraham, under the dominion of the Law ; and the last 2,000 would be the age of the Messiah. Now, as the destruction of the Temple took place in the year 3828, it follows that the

Messiah might be expected any time after 172 years had elapsed from the destruction of the Temple. Following this hint the date was confidently fixed, and when events falsified the popular expectation, as confidently readjusted.

So strongly rooted was the conviction that they were within measurable distance of the Messianic age, that R. Chananyah counselled his readers (Abodah Zarah, 9), "If any one were to say to thee 400 years after the destruction of the Temple, 'buy this field for a denar,' although it was worth a thousand, buy it not, for the time of the Messiah is at hand." A mournful commentary on this calculating craze is afforded by the fact that when a date had been fixed upon for the appearance of the deliverer, it usually turned out to be the time that witnessed disasters of the severest nature befalling the sanguine folk. Thus there is good ground for believing, for the statement is circumstantially made by Josephus (*Wars* vi., v., 4), by Tacitus (*Hist.* v. 13) and by Suetonius (*Vesp.* 4), that the period about 70 of the C.E. was looked forward to as likely to see the advancement of a Judean to the place of governor of the habitable world. In Matthew xxiv. 34, Mark xiii. 30, and Luke xxi. 32, some of the most striking tokens of the Messianic age were declared to be about "to be fulfilled before that generation passed away." But in place of the realization of all these high-wrought hopes, the year 70 witnessed the destruction of the Temple and the fall of the Jewish nation.

The sympathy of R. Akiba for the revolutionary movement under Bar Kochba was due in part at least to his interpretation of certain verses of scripture, which seemed to him to point to the man and to his time.

In vain was it that one of his comrades confronted him with the words, "Grass will grow on thy cheeks Akiba and the Messiah not yet have come!" (Midrash Echa 2). He staked his life on the result; and his error was terribly avenged, not only on him but on the multitudes whose justification lay in his example. Or, to take an example from mediaeval times: It had been computed, as the result of a mystical interpretation of the word *ranu*—(=the Hebrew consonants of which are *resh*=200, *nun*=50, and *vav*=6)—in Jeremiah xxxi. 7, that the son of David would appear towards the end of the 256th lunar cycle, between 1096 and 1104 of the C.E., and lead Israel back to their own land. But the former year marked the melancholy epoch of the first crusade, and "in lieu of the trumpet blast of the Redeemer they heard the wild execrations of a mob thirsting for their blood."

The "Calculation of the End" seems to have exercised an irresistible fascination upon minds in other respects sober enough. Even men like Saadyah yielded to the temptation; while Maimonides (Iggereth Teman), after taking his great predecessor to task for his weakness, himself "treads the primrose path of dalliance," and makes a calculation of his own, according to which Messiah ought to have appeared in the year of the creation 4976, corresponding to 1216 C.E., from about which time dates, in the opinion of Graetz, the deepest degradation of the Jews of Europe during six centuries. Far healthier was the tone, although the language was rather blunt, of those who, like R. Shemuel b. Nachmeni, and R. Jonathan, said (San. 97b.), "Let the bones be broken of those who calculate the end; because when the set time has arrived and the prediction

has not been verified, it is the belief in the Messiah that suffers, and people think he will not come at all. But hope patiently for him, as is written, Though he tarrieth hope for him!" The day of redemption lies outside the range of human vision. "It will come in the ripeness of time and with the grace of God," said one. "All the computed terms have passed and the matter dependeth now on repentance and good deeds," taught another (San. 97b. Yer. Taan., 1., Debarim Rab. 2). While a third, dealing with the seeming contradiction in Isaiah (lx. 22), "I the Lord, will hasten it in its time," offered this beautiful reconciliation, "If my people are worthy, I will hasten their deliverance; if not, it shall come—in its appointed time."

Let this suffice for us also, if there are any here or elsewhere eager to know when and how we shall reach that happy age. Tokens are not wanting that we are on the right way, tokens that meet us on our voyage through life, like those which the mariner sometimes passes on the seas and which tell him that land must lie beyond. Since this great hope was first proclaimed in clear and full tones to the world, how vast has been the progress that has blessed every branch of human endeavour, how incalculable the change for the better in almost all conditions of human life! Still the warning is needed to beware of confusion between the material and the moral progress of the world. Of the former no one is likely to be left in ignorance in this the 50th year of the reign of Queen Victoria. But we live for other purposes than the accumulation of wealth, the distribution of commodities and the spread of Empire; and other and nobler work awaits us, before we shall sight the realm over which Messiah shall reign—

not a heavenly kingdom, be it still borne in mind, but an earthly one, in labouring for which we may find perhaps

> Earth but the shadow of Heaven, and things therein
> Each to the other like more than on earth is thought.

WHERE THE CLERGY FAIL

(*An Address delivered at Queen Square House on Sunday, Jan. 17, 1904, as Hon. President of Jews' College Union Society.*)

In the Romanes Lecture for 1896, the late Bishop of London, Dr. Mandell Creighton, relates how, on one occasion, when he was a Fellow of his College, conversation at dinner turned upon university life. In a pause, one who had until then been silent addressed the only stranger present thus: "I think you ought to know that in Oxford we are all so well acquainted with one another's good qualities that we only talk about those points which are capable of amendment." I might give a similar reason for my choice of subject for the address it is my duty and privilege to deliver as Hon. President of the Jews' College Union. To dwell upon the merits and successes of the clergy would be a work of supererogation; we all know them. Our time can, therefore, be more profitably employed in directing our attention to some of the points in which they fail to come up to, I will not say an ideal standard, but to the requirements of a fair and sober conception of what the clerical office demands. And though there is a certain difficulty, there is also a certain advantage, in a clergyman speaking on this topic to others who are, or are to be, members of the same profession as himself. He can mingle experience with observation, criticism with confession.

Let me admit forthwith that it is in the very nature of things that any man occupying the position of a minister of religion, I care not who he is, must fail often and lamentably. The character and the magnitude of his office make that result inevitable. The well-nigh universal rule among all denominations of having a body of men trained and recognized as leaders in religion, and our own familiarity with the fact itself within the limits of our own community, may blunt our appreciation of what the name of clergyman properly stands for. But can we blind ourselves to the solemn issues involved in the existence of such a profession as the clergy? How is any one man entitled to be considered more a servant of God than any other? Can we, rightly speaking, justify such a differentiation of functions, in Judaism at least? And admitting, for the sake of argument, that religious teachers must form a profession by themselves, because what is everybody's business is nobody's business, what vast and varied, what rare and lofty qualifications are needed to make the true clergyman! Among all professions, that of the clergy stands in need of knowledge the fullest, of sympathy the deepest, of unselfishness the most perfect, of character the most spotless. I do not know if any of my clerical colleagues lay claim to all these qualifications, or if any of their generous friends or admiring relations do so for them. For myself, whenever I think of it, I marvel at my own temerity. Had I not been so young when I entered upon this sacred calling, I doubt if later I should have had the courage to do so.

In no other profession is the temptation to vanity so great. A young man, generally at an age when he would be very unlikely to have any mundane business

of importance entrusted to him, is suddenly raised to a position that places him on a spiritual elevation above the greater number of his brethren. He is conscious that all eyes are focussed upon him. In office he is arrayed in a distinctive uniform. Out of office he wears a garb usually closely copied from the prevailing fashion of the dominant Church. He has assigned to him a distinctive title of honour and reverence. He leads the devotions of his people. He addresses with a certain note of authority, without contradiction or interruption, assemblies of men and women, many of whom are old enough to be his parents or grandparents, and not a few who are at least his equals in intellectual power and attainments. He has also, perhaps, a number of ardent unreasoning admirers. In short, he blossoms out all at once into a personage whose very office is regarded as a token that its incumbent is a man of more than ordinary wisdom and virtue. It is no wonder if Satan, in the form of vanity, lays siege to his soul, and puts him in perils from which nothing but innate strength of character and the grace of God can deliver him. Even when he grows older, the old besetting sin is not always cast behind him.

If a parable could cure people of conceit, the following from the Russo-Jewish fabulist, Gordon, ought to do it. When the Philistines wished to send back the captured ark of Israel, they placed it in a cart, and to the cart they harnessed a couple of cows. Behind marched the lords of the Philistines. And the cows, making their way to Beth-Shemesh, lowing as they went, noticed that wherever they passed the Israelites came to meet them, rejoicing, and paying them honour, and bowing down before them. Then said the cows to each

other: "We are no ordinary cows; look how the people are reverencing us; we must be divine." But they knew not, silly creatures, that it was not to them that men bowed down and paid homage, but to the precious treasure they were carrying. And when the cows came to the field of Joshua the Beth-Shemite, the people took possession of the ark, but the cows they slaughtered and offered them up as a burnt-offering.

So, many a vain synagogue functionary, holding the Law aloft, and seeing the congregation bowing down before him, is uplifted in his own esteem and deems himself more than a common mortal; but he considers not, foolish man, that not to him is this homage paid, but to the Torah, and after it is taken from him he is accounted a thing of nought. The parallel halts somewhat at the end, for the fate of the cows does not overtake the vain precentor, but it is close enough in other respects for those who have eyes to see.

It is a frequent complaint that clergymen are not always treated with the respect due to their calling. But what if it should be found that they themselves fail to treat their calling with the respect due to it? Can they complain if those whom they are supposed to instruct not only learn from them, but better the instruction? Take the performance of the sacred offices of the synagogue. These admit of two vicious extremes, though which of the two is more fatal to clerical dignity—not to speak of higher and more important interests—I am not prepared to decide. There is perfunctoriness at the one end. A man is soon found out whose idea of service in the sanctuary is something to be got through with as little preparation as possible beforehand, and with as little cost as possible of thought during the

actual process. The disinclination to concentrate the whole mind and heart on the act of worship for the time being; the tendency to what, in the rabbinic discipline, is so often referred to, and condemned as "Heseach Hadaath," is a defect that may need struggling against even in the best of us; but if it be not resisted, especially during the earlier and formative period of a clergyman's life, the effect will be sure to make itself apparent in his every unguarded look and tone and gesture. What is *in* him will show *through* him. And it will sink into the very soul of the laity, who will consider themselves justified in treating their minister as little better than a praying machine; though just because he is a living, and not an inanimate, machine they will decline to regard him with the holy awe with which the Tibetan regards that other curious apparatus of worship—his praying wheel.

And, as with the offices of prayer and praise, so with the responsible task of preaching. All perfunctoriness in this sacred work; all inadequate, slovenly, indolent preparation for preaching; all listless, lifeless, soulless, senseless sermons, will have to be paid for in the loss of the esteem of your hearers. Vain is it to complain of this. We reap as we have sown.

But there is the other vicious extreme, and the mischief it does is not easily calculated. Is it surprising that clergymen should fail to secure the respect of those whose respect is worth having, if they make the sanctuary and the Divine service the place and the occasion of personal display? All "showing off" in voice and manner, all histrionic tricks, all ostentation and affectation, all simulated or artificially stimulated emotion, are an abomination in the sight of those who know

and can judge. To whom, one is often forced to ask, does the precentor or the preacher address his prayers in synagogue—to God or to the congregation? That question was answered in an account, of which I have heard, of a great religious meeting held in Boston, some time ago. The reporter, by a couch of inspiration, described the prayer offered up by the Rev. Dr. Blank as "one of the most beautiful and effective prayers ever delivered to a Boston audience." Every form of display argues unreality, and unreality, however disguised, leaves the heart unconvinced, and, need one say, unconverted. When Rabbi Zera was appointed to his sacred office, they greeted him with snatches of a bridal song; "No cosmetics, no rouge, no hair-curling, but yet what a graceful gazelle!"

A clerical caste is a national calamity. But clergymen themselves are the greatest losers if a barrier is allowed to grow up between them and the laity. Such a thing did not exist in olden times. Nor, happily, does it always exist in modern days. Mr. Claude Montefiore, in his tribute to Dr. P. F. Frankl, the Berlin Rabbi, refers to him as one of the ministers to whom one could speak not only as to a clergyman, but as to a man. Yet it is, unfortunately, too true that the clergyman is often the last man to whom a layman will open his heart.

One reason why we often fail to convince, or even to impress, those to whom we minister, is that we make no sufficient effort to get at the layman's point of view on religious questions. We deal with these questions in a professional way—a way which does not appeal to the non-professional mind. We may, possibly, be grasping the truth, but we hold it in such a manner that others do

not and cannot see it, and we leave upon them the impression that we have not really got hold of it ourselves, but are only engaged in a piece of make-believe. It is good, therefore, to put ourselves into frequent and close communication with the best minds of the laity, to study their difficulties, even to ask for suggestions as to matters in which they wish for light and help from the pulpit. I believe that many a lay sermon might teach a congregation of clergymen more than many a clerical sermon teaches a congregation of laymen. Anyhow, it is of vital consequence that we should be familiar with both points of view. The genial Professor at the Breakfast Table speaks of "the parallax of thought and feeling as they appear to the observers from two very different points of view." "If," he says, "you wish to get the distance of a heavenly body, you know that you must take two observations from remote points of the earth's orbit, in midwinter and midsummer, for instance. To get the parallax of heavenly truths you must take an observation from the position of the laity, as well as of the clergy. Teachers and students of theology get a certain look, certain tones of the voice, a clerical gait, a professional neckcloth, and habits of mind as professional as their externals." It is these habits we ought to strive to correct, and in proportion as we succeed in this, in the same proportion our usefulness will increase as religious teachers.

Do not, however, from what I have just said, fall into the opposite error of imagining that the whole drift and character of your teaching is to be guided and shaped by the will of one or two masterful members of the congregation. In every synagogue there are a few such masterful ones, but unless a man has a

conscience which is more sacred to him than his skin, he may be driven to play false with his highest ideals simply from dread of displeasing the influential Mr. So-and-So. No clergyman is more despicable than he who, afraid to say what he thinks, says just what he thinks other people expect him to think. Of such a one the Scriptures says, "Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord deceitfully."

There is another temptation to which young preachers, and I fear some who are no longer young, sometimes succumb. It it to preach in order to show how clever they are. Learning, well - assimilated learning — not chunks of undigested quotations—is, of course, of the very essence of a good sermon. (I owe an apology for making so obvious a remark in Jews' College, and before men who have studied homiletics under Mr. Israel Abrahams.) But the difference between the scholar and the showman is seen nowhere more clearly than in the pulpit, and deliberately to utilize the pulpit in order to let people know what a lot of things you know is, to say the least, offensive. Equally offensive and objectionable is the tendency to say smart things, so that you may get yourself talked of, and impose upon your hearers by your ingenuity, It would be a good thing if all such efforts were rewarded as were those of a candidate for the ministry who hoped to make a sensation by preaching his trial sermon on the word *but*. He took his text from 2 Kings v. 1: "Now Naaman, captain of the host of the king of Syria, was a great man with his master, and honourable; he was also a mighty man in valour, but he was a leper." The preacher's object was to show that the greatest men had their trials and their defects. Men might be

this and they might be that, *but* there was always something against them. And the preacher prided himself not a little on his cleverness in delivering a whole sermon round a simple conjunction like "but." Of course, he was no Hebraist, for, as all here know, the Hebrew original is innocent of any "but." It runs simply: "And the man was a mighty man in valour, a leper," the connective being omitted by the rhetorical figure known as asyndeton. But trifles like these do not affect some homilists. When he had finished, and met the wardens and others in the vestry, they said to him, "Well, sir, you have certainly preached a very remarkable sermon, *but* you are not the man to suit this place; that is all we have to say to you."

You say, perhaps, "But Jewish congregations have such bad taste in sermons." Supposing it to be the case that the taste of an average congregation among us is bad—and I am not prepared to deny it—it is the minister's duty to raise and improve it, and no amount of praise we may evoke for our performance is a compensation for the feeling that, in our desire to tickle people's fancy, or to pander to their prejudices, we have been unfaithful to the highest we knew.

It is the fashion nowadays to disparage preaching. In how far the clergy have themselves contributed to this result it is not for me to say, but I want, in this place above all, most emphatically to impress upon those who will before long be my colleagues in the ministry, and will, I trust, live to do greater honour to it, that nothing can take the place of the preacher's work in the service of the sanctuary. Chazanuth is good; secretarial work is good; visiting the poor and sick is good; attending meetings for communal purposes

is good; begging for synagogues, charities, and schools is good, if unpleasant; making yourself amiable all round is good and pleasant; but with all these the great work for which men enter the ministry must not be lost sight of—it is in order, with all the force of a well-stored mind and highly trained intellect, and a profound moral conviction and purpose, to teach the Word of God to their brethren, young and old; to help them to the perception of the highest truths of religion; to uplift their souls out of the rut of the common, the sordid, the selfish, in life; to speak a message of comfort to the sorrowing, of hope to the despondent, of counsel to the perplexed, of courage to the struggling and aspiring.

Make no mistake about this. Preaching is not only the most important, it is the most difficult—good preaching, I mean, is the most difficult, the most arduous, the most exacting of all a clegryman's duties, and on that account alone an honest minister will not shirk it, or treat it as a light thing, but will put his heart and soul into it; will take care his flock shall be fed with the best, the purest, the most nutritious food it is in his power to supply. I do not for a moment underrate the other parts of a clergyman's duties, but unless he is prepared to fail as a religious influence, he must realize in all moral earnestness that he is, with all his defects, the nearest approach our day provides to the prophets of old, and that the distinctive function of the prophet was to speak out from *his* heart to the heart of his people.

If the glory that rests upon a minister of religion is often more than he deserves, the burden of responsibility that is laid upon him is sometimes more than he is

fitted to bear. It is a fearful thing to think that for whatever goes wrong, morally or religiously, with his flock, he is held primarily answerable. Against such a sweeping condemnatory judgment he may at times justly protest. One result of his labours there is, however, for which he cannot repudiate, or even attenuate, his responsibility. No man, let us remember, ever leaves the house of worship exactly as he enters it; he is either better or worse for his visit. For Heaven's sake, my brothers, and for the sake of our own honour and conscience, let no one, through aught we may have done or said, quit that house a worse man than he entered it.

But though a clergyman's influence culminates in the synagogue, it is not there that the foundation of it is laid. For him service begins long before he reaches the door of the sanctuary. It is impossible to separate a man's preaching from his life. Laymen have an infallible instinct in this matter. "A man's life," says Canon Newbolt, "follows him into the pulpit, and his sermon is a palimpsest on another writing, only imperfectly obliterated to the eyes of those who have become acquainted with it during the week." The whole scheme of a Jewish minister's duty is set out before us in one sentence of Holy Writ: "Now Ezra prepared his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments."

Of all a preacher's sins, the one for which pardon is hardest to obtain is preaching at inordinate length. Not many of us, I fear, have a perfectly clean record in that respect. What is long or short in a sermon depends, of course, to a great extent, upon the appetite of your congregation. There are people, our own people, too—need I say they are not English Jews?—

who do not object to sit for two or three hours at a homiletic meal. But very few of us are likely to have to cater for such a congregation. And very few of us, to speak candidly, have the right to speak at great length. It is all very well to plead, "But I must do justice to my subject." In doing justice to our subject are we excused showing mercy to our hearers? Besides, what is the use of talking of justice to our subject when the jury will not listen, and become impatient, irritable, and irate? Is not that the very way to prevent justice being done to our subject? A barrister who acted in that manner would soon be left without clients.

Every now and then the question is started as to which is the right mode of presenting a sermon. Sermons, it has been said, are produced either by the viviparous or the oviparous mode—terms intended to denote the production of a discourse by a direct or living birth (extempore), and the production of it by the process of the written composition, the manuscript representing the egg. I do not think any hard and fast line can be laid down on the subject. Different men have different faculties. Each method has something in its favour, and something against it. That, however, the weight of evidence is on the side of the extempore discourse as the more effective with the masses, there can be no doubt. I say "extempore," not what our foreign brethren call "memorized" sermons. I do not think the most consummate pulpit artist ever gets rid of the artifical ring in a sermon learned by rote. At all events, any other pulpit artist, consummate or not, can detect it; and the essential difference between the man who preaches from notes, and the one who preaches by

heart, is that the one has his manuscript on his pulpit, and the other has it in his desk. For my own part, I have never listened to that kind of sermon without recalling the lines :—

> " They say he has no heart, but I deny it ;
> He has a heart, and gets his speeches by it."

Thrice favoured of the gods is he who has a genuine gift of extempore speech. Let him cultivate it with care, yea, with fear and trembling. The gift has insidious dangers of its own. It may inflate some men with pride to be praised, as the new curate was praised by the old lady : " Mr. Tawkaway, I do love to hear you preach. You speak all extrumpery, and your language is so fluid." But it is a mighty instrument of power in the mouth of a man with brains in his head. The subject well thought out, prepared, and ordered ; the word free—there is the ideal. The greatest preacher I ever heard, Charles Haddon Spurgeon, adopted that method. Before him lay the plan and outline of his discourse, to which ever and anon he would refer ; his system of division, of articulation of parts, was in itself a revelation in homiletic art ; but, to watch how, under the magic of his treatment, his " skeleton," as preachers call it, became a thing of flesh and blood, a marvellous organic whole, living, breathing, throbbing with every human emotion, aglow with spiritual fire—to watch all this was enough to ravish you, and, if you happened to be young, with some pretensions to be a preacher yourself, the happy prerogative of youth—was enough to humiliate you.

Such magicians are rare. If some of us are not among them, let us comfort ourselves with the thought that

men like Stanley and Newman held the attention and reached the very heart of their hearers, though they read every word of their sermons, without the least attempt at oratory, and that the discourses, unequalled in their day, of the Scotch divine, Dr. Thomas Chalmers, and of the great English preacher, Canon Liddon, were delivered straight from the manuscript before them. These examples ought to suffice to convince us that, providing the subject of the lecture is interesting, the matter sound, and the construction good, the fact that it is not memorized or spoken extempore is no bar to its being rendered acceptable to your hearers, or to its being delivered with all requisite energy and fire. Still, I am bound to confess that if my time came over again, and if I had gifts which I do not possess, and if I were wiser than I am, I should in this, and in many other things, do differently from what I have done.

A great deal is made of the gift or the absence of the gift of a good voice. I am convinced that the value of the voice element is grossly exaggerated as an item in a preacher's success or failure. Some of the greatest speakers have had inferior voices, but they knew what to do with such an instrument as was theirs, and often, despite natural defects, learned to be clear in speech as they already were in thought. Gladstone, asked who was the best speaker he had ever heard, said Richard Lalor Sheil, although it was notorious that Sheil had a high-pitched and singularly unpleasant voice. Dr. Joel, the Philosopher-Rabbi of Breslau, had a curious sort of cavernous voice, but his preaching found its way effectually to men's minds and hearts because it was luminous with the pure light of the most logical reasoning, and touched with a live coal from the altar

of the Lord. Where our preachers so often fail is that they do not know what to do with the voice they have. They drawl or bawl, they mumble and mouth, they persistently refuse to come out from behind their own noses, or they imagine that to be impressive they must never preach in their own natural week-a-day, work-a-day voices. A frequent result of this strained and artificial use of the voice is—apart altogether from its effect upon the congregation—"Clergyman's sore throat." If I had my way, I would have every minister of a synagogue, who was medically certified as suffering from clergyman's sore throat, fined a week's stipend. It would be cheapest in the end, and most merciful to all parties.

And here I might, in an elder-brotherly spirit, offer you a few cautions you may find of service when you are actively engaged in pastoral work. Feed your flock with food that is convenient for them. Don't talk over people's heads. Take the advice of an old preacher, and don't address your flock as if they were a herd of giraffes. Be not over lavish in the use of figures, and images, and tropes. They are dangerous things to deal with in quantities, and they often fall out with one another, making sad havoc of such sense as you may have put into your sermon. Don't mistake a florid style for eloquence and grace. Besides, it does not suit the English taste, and is usually an outrage upon the English language. That preacher was a fortunate man who, before he had got to his second sermon, received from a candid friend a line cut out of a newspaper column of death advertisements, "No flowers, by request," and took the hint. Do not get into the habit of scolding people in the pulpit, whether they be present or absent.

The absent don't know, and the present, after a while, don't care. Reserve rebuke for rare occasions, and it will be more effective. The Tochechah is only read twice a year.

Don't, in the name of pastoral decency, air your personal grievances in the pulpit. It is taking your people at an unfair advantage. Be careful never to take direct notice of what you imagine is rudeness shown to you during the service. Here is an item out of my own experience. When I delivered my trial sermon at the first synagogue to which I was appointed, I noticed that, though on the whole people listened with a kindly attention, one man, sitting in a front row, from the very beginning looked contemptuously at me, and seemed on the point of laughing aloud. My most passionate and pathetic periods left him apparently untouched, an unregenerate scoffer. The more I pleaded, the more grossly amused he seemed. I was on the point of protesting against the insult, but either my good angel or the fear of "losing the thread of my discourse" restrained me, and I descended from the pulpit with mingled emotions, some that could not be classed as clerical. After service I protested to the authorities. But they only smiled, and said, "Why, that was mad So-and-So; nobody minds him. He is in the charge of Mr. ——." Upon inquiring why so prominent a place was given him, I was told that the new synagogue grew out of the old, and took over everything from the old, the congregation being strictly conservative. I was unconvinced by the argument, but I was devoutly grateful for having been saved from the indiscretion of bandying words from the pulpit with a harmless idiot.

How ill advised retaliation from the pulpit is may be learnt from the report of a case in a police court a week or so ago. The senior curate of a church near Cardiff summoned the local doctor for assault. The clergyman, it appears, had, in a sermon, referred to Oliver Cromwell as a murderer, and to Charles I as a sainted martyr. The doctor had not so read his history. This fundamental difference of view upon two points on which universal agreement seems unobtainable led to considerable ill-feeling. The doctor conveyed his opinion of the curate by coming late to church, talking with his wife during the service, and interrupting, at times, with a loud and satirical "Amen," especially after the words from the Litany, "from envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness deliver us." Thereupon the clergyman turned to his congregation and said: "It is a pity that people not only come to church late, but also disturb the service." They met in the vestry, and angry words ensued between them. When they got outside, the doctor offered to fight the curate, and asked him to nominate two gentlemen as seconds. The latter made no reply, and the doctor then struck him on the neck with his clenched fist. In the result the defendant was fined twenty shillings and costs, but the plaintiff fared far worse, for not only did he obtain no credit for his efforts to preserve the peace, but he was severely rebuked by the Bench for having said what he did, and was told that his observation was a most unfortunate one for a clergyman to make, having regard to the personal feeling which existed between him and the doctor. The chief moral from this true tale seems to be, that in contests of this kind, whatever the apparent result, a clergyman always loses more than he gains.

The only occasion on which I allowed myself anything like retaliation (if I may be forgiven for again drawing upon my own experience) is when some irrepressible congregant, having before him a Hebrew Pentateuch, provided with vowel points and accents, dodges around me with irresponsible voice, while I am trying my utmost to read the Sedrah correctly out of the Sepher Torah. I am but a mediocre Baal Koreh, but I like to be left alone to work my way through all intricacies and difficulties, and when I am interrupted and led on the wrong tack by my prompter, whose key is always different from my own, and who, as a rule, can read neither the notes nor the words accurately, I sometimes stop suddenly, and let him roll along a little, all alone, and by his own impetus. Two or three such breaks usually leave me in undisputed possession of the field. I hope there is not much harm in such conduct. I regard it as a legitimate form of "passive resistance."

No doubt clergymen, like other mortals, have a good deal to put up with from all sorts of peculiar people. There are the faddists and the fussy, and the cavillers, the self-important, the petty, the unduly exacting, the seemingly unsatisfiable. They are all very irritating, no doubt. But a little self-restraint, tact, and good humour on our part will go a long way to make us proof against vexations that are very seldom intentionally inflicted, and we shall live to make friends of those we once deemed "impossible" persons, and discover that there is some good in them after all, even although they did not recognize the good in us at first sight.

In the long run—though I know the risk to which I expose myself in making this dogmatic assertion—in the

long run all constituencies on a democratic basis get the representatives they deserve. So also congregations, with their free electoral system, get the ministers they deserve, or at least those they want. Conversely, all candidates for clerical offices get—but no, gentlemen, I am not going to expose myself to a fierce volley from all my friends and foes upon whom fortune has not yet benignantly shone, or between whose estimate of themselves and the estimate formed of them by congregations there is a regrettable disharmony. Perhaps, I may more conveniently state the case in the form of an anecdote. A clergyman, of the impatient and not over modest order, was once bewailing his fate to a friend. "Isn't mine a pitiable case?" he said. "I don't seem to make any impression upon my congregation. Week after week I have to preach to nothing but a lot of asses." "Well," replied his friend, "you must admit you have got what you deserve." "But I don't admit it." "Yes, you do; don't you regularly address that lot of asses as 'my dear brethren'?"

To hold your people, and to lead them, you must seek them, and generally outside the synagogue. Visiting among our congregants is one of the most important, as well as most agreeable, branches of our work, though it is also one that grows ever more difficult. Only too well we know how neglect of it lessens our chances of usefulness.

I suppose there are very few who can take credit to themselves for doing this part of their task thoroughly. A clergyman must often decide between a variety of claims upon his time and energies, and, providing he is not downright self-indulgent and slothful, it is to be hoped that his people will judge him leniently. However,

in visiting among his people, a sensible clergyman will be careful not to obtrude his own personality. He will be so interested in his flock that he will sink all thought of the shepherd. Least of all will he allow it to be thought that he has done an act of condescension. There are men in clerical garb who imagine that the chief thing they have to do when they call upon the members of their congregation is to hold forth about their precious selves, about what they know, and have done, or about the wrongs they have suffered, and the wilful blindness of those who cannot recognize in them what they so manifestly are—stars of the first magnitude. All this is shockingly bad pastoral manners.

So, too, is the clerical habit of trying to monopolize the conversation on these occasions. Clergymen do it quite unconsciously. Of course, you may be a great talker. Many a man who can't preach a sermon to save his life can talk enough to shorten other people's. But we shall all do well to remember that the visited should be encouraged to speak their minds, and open their hearts to the visitor. You must not even mind their saying, supposing the subject to turn on religion, "I don't profess to be an orthodox Jew, and I hope I shall not shock you, but my idea of religion is——." Then comes your opportunity, if you only know how wisely to avail yourself of it. Anyhow, you may take it that the golden rule for all social intercourse, both lay and clerical, is: "In conversation the exchange should always be at par."

One matter there is upon which turns far oftener than is suspected the success or failure of a clergyman's career. It is a matter which I believe is not dealt with in the usual treatises on pastoral theology, and about

which, I am sure—though I have not made particular inquiries upon the subject—nothing is taught in the curriculum of the students of this institution. I refer to the minister's choice of a wife. Everybody has heard the old rabbinic adages about "Ezer" and "Kenegdo," that, according to a man's deserts, or the lack of them, so is his wife to him a help or a hindrance, and about "Matsa" and "Motsa," that "a woman makes or mars her husband." True enough in their general application, with no class of the community are they more true than with the clergy. Since, in the Jewish pastorate, celibacy is not regarded as a qualification, importance attaches to the shepherdess, as well as to the shepherd. In how many ways can she directly and indirectly help forward her husband's work, and contribute to the welfare and progress of his flock! In the social sphere, failure in which may seriously cripple a clergyman's general usefulness, who does not know that she is the predominant partner? If she is sensible enough not to consider the whole world in league against her husband because people do not fall down and worship him, how often may she save him, too, from making a fool of himself. Few clergymen who have been fortunate enough to have made even a moderate success of their careers, will hesitate to acknowledge to what human co-operation that success has been, in great measure, due. But this is for the maturer clergy, who have already "built their house and planted their vineyard."

Let my last words be words of brotherly counsel to my younger colleagues, those whose period of apprenticeship seems so long and hard to them, to take heart of grace, and not consider their career a failure because

their work is done in an inconspicuous and contracted sphere. The community is getting more and more capable of appreciating true worth in its ministers. Its judgment is growing, and, I believe, its taste is improving. For its own sake it will be careful to select the most fitting instruments. You won't be left for ever to do inferior work, if you are fit for superior. "The stone that is fit for the wall will not be left in the roadway," says an Eastern proverb. "No man is chosen for great things until he has been tried in little."

But is not the division into great and little altogether misleading, and unworthy of us when we speak of the work we are permitted to do for God and His people? Let me cite to you a passage out of one of the ordination addresses of Dr. Stubbs, late Bishop of Oxford. With the change of a word or two, you will find them perfectly applicable to the case of Jewish ministers, whose lot it is to be bound to the wheel of clerical routine and drudgery :—

"Under the weariness of intensely prosaic routine, under the repulsiveness of unvaried commonplace, quite as much as in the stirring, stimulating, struggling energy of open combat, the servant of the Lord finds his errand and his reward. The daily visit to the village school, the ever-recurring need of trying to make the things that are to be made clearer to children clearer to yourself; the daily visiting of the people, trying to get them to see that their cares, their burdens, their sorrows and their sins, are cares, burdens, sorrows, sins on your own heart and conscience, but ending, in nine cases out of ten, nine days out of ten, in the simplest exchange of civil words and the maintenance of familiar acquaintanceship; the daily looking over the pages of

the Bible, which are as familiar to you as your own thoughts and in danger of becoming quite as immaterial; the daily performance, if you do perform them, of the prescribed offices of devotion; the hammering out of sermons, which, whilst you write them, seem to lose all chance of touching the hearts of those for whom you mean them, and to become cold and humdrum as the ink dries, which yet He may direct to the heart of the hearer; is it not one test of your mission, your fitness, and your earnestness, how far you can put into these simple expressions of outside work these principles of the mission you have undertaken? 'If He had asked of me some great thing, would I not have done it?' If I fail in these small things, what could I do in the great?"

JEWS AND CORONATIONS

(Paper read before the Jewish Historical Society of England April 19, 1903.)

THIS Society has a fine sense of the fitness of things and times if not of persons, and it was arranged that I should make a few remarks on Jews and Coronations on the morrow of the day originally fixed for the coronation of Edward VII. The serious illness of the King rendered this arrangement inappropriate, and the proposed lecture was for the moment abandoned. But though the whole idea was thus shorn of its topical glamour, I have been held to my promise, and I now redeem it.

After this preamble, I trust your expectations will not be abnormally raised as to the value of what will be placed before you this evening. The fact is, the material is not so abundant as I had hoped, or perhaps I should rather say that I am not so gifted with the sleuth-hound's scent of some of my friends and colleagues for hidden-away material of interest to the Anglo-Jewish-historian. However, I must do my best with my limitations from whatever cause. I divide this lecture into two parts—the one dealing with Jews as personally affected by the coronation of English sovereigns, the other treating of Jewish influence upon the Coronation Service.

In pre-expulsion days the Jews were not specially affected by the accession of a new monarch. No tallage was imposed, and the new king simply walked into the rights which his predecessor enjoyed over the person and

property of the Jews. It is remarkable that the first coronation of which we have a full and circumstantial account is that of Richard I, September 3, 1189. Stubbs (*Const. Hist.*, i. 496) says that it was carried out in such splendour and minute formality as to form a precedent for all subsequent ceremonies of the sort. The event has been often described, and as every one here knows it was full of melancholy interest to the Jews of this country. Let us glance at the sources from which later accounts have had to draw. The original authority[1] was a writer formerly described as Benedictus Abbas (Benedict of Peterboro'[2]), but now virtually known to be Richard Fitz Nigel. He was a contemporary writer, and as the King's Treasurer, was probably an eyewitness of what he relates. Mr. J. H. Round disputes the view that some now lost Exchequer record was used by Richard Fitz Nigel, and contends with much ingenuity that the author of the *Gesta* wrote from his own knowledge. Fitz Nigel's account is followed by Roger of Hoveden,[3] also a contemporary, but not an eyewitness,[4] adding matters of very little importance, and making a few changes which, as we shall see, do not improve the narrative. The next is Roger of Wendover, a younger contemporary, who[5] uses Hoveden. Matthew Paris,[6] a later writer, born about 1200 or a little earlier, repeats Wendover.

The fullest account of the Jewish incident is that

[1] J. H. Round, *The Commune of London*, p. 201.

[2] *Gesta Regis Henrici Secundi, Benedicti Abbatis*, ed. Stubbs (1867), ii. 83.

[3] *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Hoveden*, ed. Stubbs, p. 11.

[4] He was in Yorkshire on the death of Henry II. and accession and early years of Richard I.

[5] *Chronica sive Flores Historiarum.*

[6] Both in his *Historia Anglorum, Historia Minor*, ed. Madden, ii. 9; and in *Chronica Majora*, ed. Luard, ii. 350.

by William of Newburgh,[1] also living at the time of the coronation of Richard but not present, and giving what seems like an expanded version of Benedict.

So that we get the following genealogical sequence :—

BENEDICT ABBAS.
|
WILLIAM OF NEWBURGH AND HOVEDEN.
|
WENDOVER and MATTHEW PARIS.

All but the last, be it remembered, were living at the time, 1189, of which they speak. There is also a brief allusion to the incidents in Ralph of Coggeshale's contemporary *Chronicon Anglicarum* (ed. Stevenson, p. 27); and a further reference may be found in another contemporary, Ralph de Diceto's *Ymagines Historiarium* (ed. Stubbs, ii. p. 69).

Let me now read to you the translation of the first of these documents. Richard Fitz Nigel's account runs as follows :—

> Meanwhile the King had divested himself of his crown and royal robes, and had put on a crown and garments of a lighter sort, and thus arrayed he went to dine. And the archbishops and abbots and the other clergy sat with him at his table, each one according to his order and dignity. The earls, however, and barons and knights sat at other tables and feasted magnificently. To them while dining enter the chiefs of the Jews, despite the King's prohibition. And because the King had on the previous day by public edict forbidden any Jew or woman to come to his coronation, the courtiers stretched forth their hands against the Jews, robbed and scourged them and cast them out of the King's court. Some they slew, some they left half dead. But one of those Jews, who was called Benedict, a Jew of York, was so severely beaten and wounded that his life was despaired of; he was in such terror of death that he accepted *baptism from William, the prior* of the church of St. Mary of York, and received the name of William. Thus he escaped the peril of death at the hands of the persecutors.

[1] Ed. Howlett, bk. iii. ch. i. (vol. i. p. 294).

But the people of the city of London, hearing how the courtiers had raged against the Jews, attacked the Jews of the city and spoiled them, and slew many of both sexes, set fire to their houses, and reduced them to dust and ashes. Nevertheless a few of them escaped that slaughter, shutting themselves in the Tower of London, or they lay hid in the houses of their friends. On the following day, when the King heard what had been done, he sent his servants through the city and had a number of these malefactors arrested and brought before him. Three of them were hanged, after judgment, by order of the court, one of them because he had stolen the property of a Christian, and the other two because they had set fire to the city, whence the houses of Christians were burned. Then the King sent for the man who had already from being a Jew been made a Christian, those being present who had seen him baptized, and asked him if he were a real Christian (*effectus*). He answered, No, but that in order to escape death he had allowed the Christians to do with him what they pleased. Thereupon the King asked the Archbishop of Canterbury, many being present, archbishops and bishops, what was to be done with him. The Archbishop replied, less discreetly than he should, saying, " If he will not be a God's man, let him be the devil's man." (*Si ipse homo Dei esse non vult, sit homo diaboli.*) And so he who had been a Christian returned to the Jewish law (*Ad legem Judaicam*).

On the following day the King received the homage and oaths of fidelity from the archbishops, bishops, abbots, earls, and barons of his land. Meanwhile the King sent messengers and letters through all the counties of England, commanding that the Jews should suffer no forfeiture, that they should be left in peace. But before the publication of that edict (the) Jews who were in the town of Dunstable were converted to the Christian faith, and baptized, and divorced their wives. A similar thing happened in many cities of England.

We will next take Roger of Hoveden's account :—

While the King was seated at table, the chief men of the Jews came to offer presents to him, but as they had been forbidden the day before to come to the King's court on the day of the coronation, the common people, with scornful eye and insatiable heart, rushed upon the Jews and stripped them, and then scourging them, cast them forth out of the King's hall. Among these was Benedict, a Jew of York, who, after having been so maltreated and wounded by the Christians that his life was despaired of,

was baptized by William, prior of the church of St. Mary of York, in the church of the *Innocents*, and was named William, and thus escaped the peril of death at the hands of the persecutors.

The citizens of London, on hearing this, attacked the Jews in the city and burned their houses, but by the kindness of their Christian friends, some few made their escape. On the day after the coronation, the King sent his servants, and caused those offenders to be arrested who had set fire to the city; not for the sake of the Jews, but on account of the houses and property of the Christians which they had burned and plundered, and he ordered some of them to be hanged. On the same day, the King ordered the before named William, who from a Jew had become a Christian, to be presented to him, on which the King said to him, "Who are you?" He replied, "I am Benedict, thy Jew, of York." On this the King turned to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the others who had told him that the said Benedict had become a Christian, and said to them, "Did you not tell me that he had become a Christian?" To which they answered, "Even so, my lord." Whereupon he said to them, "What are we to do with him" To which the Archbishop of Canterbury, less circumspectly than he might, in a spirit of anger, made reply, "If he does not choose to be a Christian, let him be a man of the devil;" whereas he ought to have answered, "We demand that he shall be brought to a Christian trial, as he has become a Christian, and now contradicts that fact." But inasmuch as there was no person to offer any opposition thereto, the aforesaid William relapsed into Jewish wickedness (*reversus est ad Judaicam pravitatem*). After a short time he died at Northampton, and he was refused burial in the common cemetery, as well of the Jews as of the Christians, on the one hand because he had been a Christian, and on the other because, "like a dog, he had returned to his vomit."

You will notice the discrepancies between the two accounts. They are not without significance. Hoveden puts it that the recalcitrant Archbishop said of the recusant Jew, "If he will not be a *Christian*, let him be the devil's man." The original of Benedict Abbas is "*Si ipse homo Dei esse non vult, sit homo diaboli.*" Again, Benedictus Abbas' account ends with, "And so he who had been a Christian returned to the Jewish *law*," which

Hoveden interprets and expands into "The aforesaid William (the Jew's baptismal name) lapsed into Jewish wickedness." "He returned like a dog to his vomit." Roger of Wendover has also a strange variant of one part of the coronation story. He says: "The courtiers laid hands on the Jews, although they had come *in secret*, and when they had robbed and frightfully scourged them, they cast them out of the church."

There is no reason to suppose that they came secretly, and it was assuredly not into the church they went. No Jew of those times would have entered a church.

There is one peculiarly pleasant remark in Hoveden's account. He tells us that some of the Jews made their escape "by the kindness of their Christian friends." It is clear that amid all the frenzy of the mob, and at no little danger to themselves, some of the Christian intimates of the Jews offered a refuge to the latter in their hour of need.

Of William of Newburgh an extract of some length may be read in Mr. J. Jacobs' "The Jews of Angevin England." William of Newburgh has a slightly different account of the story of Benedict of York, which Mr. Jacobs has not included in his extract, and which it may be interesting to cite. "That Benedict, however, who, as has been related, received Christian baptism under compulsion, not believing it truly in his heart but making only an empty confession with his mouth (*inani tantum oris confessione aerem verberans*), was on the following day brought before the King and questioned whether he was a Christian. He replied that he had been compelled by the Christians to be baptized, but that in his mind he had always been a Jew, and that as such he wished to die, since it was not possible for him to live any longer,

for that with the wounds he had received the previous day his death was imminent. Cast forth from the presence of the King, the Jew apostatised from Christianity, and thus became twice as much a child of Gehenna as he had been before." William adds that Benedict died a few days after; Hoveden locates the Jew's death at Northampton. Benedictus Abbas seems to imply that the Jew survived.

Mr. Jacobs points out (p. 100) that the accounts differ as to the originators of the riot. According to Benedict Abbas, the Jews bringing gifts were attacked by the *curiales*, the nobles about the court; Hoveden speaks of the crowd (*plebs*); William of Newburgh ascribes the beginning of the trouble to "a certain Christian" (*quidam Christianus*); Ralph de Diceto (*Ymagines*, ed. Stubbs, ii. 69) describes the mischief-makers as foreigners (*pax Judæorum, quam ab antiquis temporibus obtinuerant, ab aliengenis interrumpitur*). The exclusion of women from the coronation is already mentioned in Benedict Abbas, but he gives no reason for this exclusion. Matthew of Paris (on the authority, probably, of Ralph of Coggeshale) attributes the exclusion of women as well as of Jews to the fear lest they should exercise a magical influence on the King at his coronation.

Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury, did not long survive Benedict of York, with whose baptism and relapse he was associated. Baldwin's character was "at once wavering and impulsive" (*Dict. of National Biography*, iii. 32). On the year before Richard's coronation, Baldwin took the Cross and in 1190 set out on the Crusade. He died at Acre on November 19 of that year.

Seven centuries in time, and more than seven centuries in thought and sentiment, intervene between the corona-

tion of Richard I and that of Edward VII. Instead of being cast forth, robbed, and massacred because they had ventured near the scene of the coronation, many Jews were present on August 9, 1902, as honoured guests in Westminster Abbey, Jewish peers, commoners, and their wives, and others, and, best sign of all, the Chief Rabbi. Until recent times, I cannot find that Jews "assisted" in any direct way in coronation ceremonies. Their connexion with that function seems to have been of a very remote character indeed. Thus Lord Hervey, in his "Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second," relates "that, in contrast to his father, George II was very fond of pageantry and splendour, and that his Queen Caroline wore an immense quantity of gems at her coronation. Unfortunately, however, George I had distributed Queen Anne's pearls among his German favourites: only one pearl necklace was left for his daughter-in-law, and the deficiency was eked out by a quantity of magnificent pearls borrowed from Court ladies, Jews, and jewellers." [1]

Board of Deputies, Minute Book, No. I, p. 2. [That] "Jacob Franco, Benj[n]. Mendes Da Costa, Jacob Gonsales, Moses Da Costa, Isaac Salvador, Isaac Jesurun Alvares, Isaac Fernandes Nunes—

In the Name of the Community of Portuguese Jews, wait on His Grace the Duke of Devonshire, Lord Chamberlain of His Majesty's Household, to desire His Grace would favour them in *humbly presenting to His Majesty* that His Majesty's most faithful and loyal Subjects, the Portuguese Jews, being so small a Body, have not had the Honour to address, but have been permitted to testify their Duty to the Sovereign on his Accession to the Throne. They, in the like manner, *most humbly beg Leave* to condole with His Majesty on the Demise of the late King, whose

[1] Douglas Macleane, *The Great Solemnity*, p. 149.

sacred Memory will ever be revered, and to congratulate His Majesty on His Majesty's Accession to the throne of these kingdoms, humbly craving the Continuance of His Majesty's Favour and Protection, which they hope to merit by an unalterable zeal for His Majesty's most sacred Person and Service, and by promoting to the utmost of their Abilities the Benefit of his Majesty's Realms.

London, *ye 21st Novr*, 1760.

To His Grace the Duke of Devonshire,

Lord Chamberlain of His Majesty's Household, etc., etc., etc.

A deputation also waits on Sir Wm. Irby, Bart., Chamberlain to H.R.H. the Princess Dowager of Wales (mother of George III), on November 24, 1760, tor pesent the following address :—

In Behalf of the Community of Portuguese Jews who, having been permitted to testify their Duty to His Majesty, humbly beg Leave to condole with Her Royal Highness the Princess Dowager of Wales on the Decease of his Late Majesty of Glorious Memory, and to congratulate Her Royal Highness on the King Her Royal Son's Accession to the Throne, whose exalted Virtues, nourished and implanted under Her Royal Highness' Maternal Care, assure all His Majesty's subjects of a happy and glorious Reign. That the Almighty may shower down His choicest Blessings on Her Majesty, Her Royal Highness, and Her Most Illustrious Progeny, and that they may ever adorn the Throne of these Kingdoms to the latest Times shall be their most fervent Prayer.

Sir William receives the deputation very courteously, and the same day returns the written acknowledgments of the King's mother. He concludes his letter thus :—

The Princess therefore has given me Her Commands, in Her Name to return the Community Her most sincere Thanks on the Occasion. Their fervent Prayers offered up to the Almighty, joined with their good Wishes in favour of the King Her Son, of Herself, and of every Branch of Her Royal Family, cannot fail to afford Her perfect satisfaction.

I may venture to assure your Community it will be the greatest

Happiness of Her Royal Highness's Life (which may God of His great mercy long preserve amongst us) to see the King Her Son promote and maintain the true Interests, Liberties, and the Prosperity of his loyal People.

These addresses were, it appears, presented by the Portuguese alone without taking into counsel the German section of the community, and accordingly we find Mr. Aron Franks, a distinguished representative of the German congregation, protesting against this action. The result was an undertaking on the part of the committees mutually to consult each other, and to co-operate "whenever any public affair should offer that may interest the two nations," and the practical formation of a joint Committee of Deputies, the first meeting at which deputies from the two German synagogues in Duke's Place and in Magpie Alley (Leadenhall Street ?) were present, being held December 14, 1760

Board of Deputies, Minute Book, No. I, pp. 32, 33. On February 24, 1820, the Deputies resolve to offer to George IV condolences on the death of his father, and congratulations on his own succession. A sub-committee is formed to prepare an address, consisting of Messrs. I. M. Da Costa, Jos. Cohen, Jacob Mocatta, I. Van Oven, Meyer Salomons.

To the King's Most Excellent Majesty.

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN.

We, your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Deputies appointed by the several congregations of Jews in London, in behalf of those congregations and in behalf of our Brethren resident throughout the United Kingdom, most humbly beg leave to lay at the foot of your Majesty's Throne the expressions of our heartfelt condolence for the loss of our beloved and ever to be revered Monarch, your late Royal Father, and to offer to your Majesty the Assurance of our Fealty and Allegiance.

The Pious and liberal sentiments which ever swayed the Action

of our departed Sovereign have not failed to leave an indelible impression of love and respect on the minds of all his subjects; and the blessings resulting from the administration of equal laws and the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty have more especially endeared his sacred memory to the Members of the Jewish community.

Whilst we bow with humility and resignation to the decree of the Almighty, who has called our beloved Sovereign from this transitory existence to a more blissful state, we derive consolation from the contemplation of prospective happiness ensured to us by a continuance of the benignity evinced during your Majesty's Regency.

We most humbly entreat your Majesty to condescend to accept our sincere congratulations on your Majesty's accession to the exalted Throne of your Illustrious ancestors.

We most devoutly thank the Almighty for the re-establishment of your Majesty's health, and beg leave to offer our Congratulations on your Majesty's recovery from the serious and reiterated Afflictions and sufferings which your Majesty has endured.

Impressed with the most sincere sentiments of duty and devotion, the Jews of this Kingdom entreat your Majesty to regard them among your Majesty's most faithful and loyal subjects. They beg to assure your Majesty that it is their earnest wish and fervent Prayer that your Majesty may be blessed with uninterrupted Health, and that your Majesty's subjects may long enjoy the blessing of your Mild and Paternal sway.

A deputation of six members of the Board sought an interview with Lord Sidmouth, access to whom had been facilitated by a letter of introduction from Mr. N. M. Rothschild, and his lordship presented the address in their name to the king at the first subsequent levee.

On the death of George IV and accession of William IV in 1830, a similar loyal address was prepared. In the course of it they entreat his Majesty to "believe that there are not in your Majesty's widely spread Dominions any Hearts that beat more true to the touch of National Feeling than those of the Jews of this Realm. They anxiously seek every opportunity to evince how strictly

they identify their Interests with those of the State, so long the Happy Asylum of their Fathers, their own beloved country." Expressions of loyal attachment to Queen Adelaide follow. On the present occasion there was a very strong desire to present this loyal address in person to the sovereign, but again, on the advice of Mr. Rothschild, whose opinion had been asked and whose judgment was regarded as decisive in all questions of communal tactics, it was resolved to present the address through Sir Robert Peel, Secretary of State. Mr. Moses Mocatta energetically but vainly protested against this course, and drew the attention of the community to the encouraging manner in which Quakers and other Dissenters had been received by the King and their addresses had been replied to.

It was not till the accession of her late Majesty that the address of the Jewish community was received by the sovereign in person. The details were left in the hands of Mr. Moses Montefiore, six deputies, and three gentlemen not members of the Board, being chosen for the purpose of a deputation. " Their grief " at the death of his late Majesty " they avowed was assuaged by the accession of a Princess whose virtues add lustre to her crown, and who on the moment of ascending the Throne has given utterance to sentiments that must be responded to by every British bosom." [1]

Moses Montefiore, a Sheriff of London, received Queen Victoria on her first visit to the city after her accession in 1837. He was knighted on that occasion.

Among all the sermons and prayers preserved in various collections I have so far not been successful in tracing a single sermon or special prayer composed by Jews on

[1] Minute Book, No. II. p. 119.

the occasion of a coronation of a sovereign of this country. Of course I except the coronation of his Majesty King Edward. There are numerous prayers and addresses on such occasions as the death of a sovereign or of distinguished members of the royal family, or at the birth of a prince or princess, or in times of war or on the declaration of peace, but neither in the Montefiore nor in the Jews' College library, in the collections of the Rev. A. L. Green, Alfred Newman, or Asher Myers, or in the British Museum, is there a single one of the kind I refer to. Nor is the omission remarkable. The coronation is essentially associated with the State Church, and it is questionable whether celebrations, such as occurred in most places of worship throughout the British Empire on the coronation of Edward VII, were ever held before. Even on the present occasion these services were quite spontaneous, there were no official directions issued. In the Liturgy of the Church of England there is no form for use in places of worship on the actual day of the coronation, but there is a form for use on the anniversaries of the event.

But in former periods, though no religious services at the coronation seem to have been held outside Westminster Abbey, or wherever else (as Winchester) the coronation was held, the accession and coronation of a new ruler was signalized by the publication of a number of verses in which the grief at the death of the predecessor is quaintly entwined with joy at the installation of the successor. That the Jews bore their part in such performances may be seen from the poem of Joseph Abendanon on the death of William III. This elegy he concludes with a congratulation to Queen Anne.[1]

[1] See *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society*, ii. 145.

Abendanon was following a good English precedent, that of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. These learned bodies were in the habit of publishing volumes containing verses by various hands on public occasions, and especially on the accession of new sovereigns. I propose now to limit my remarks to these last-named collections. An account of these may be found in Wordsworth's *Scholæ Academicæ*, pp. 164 and 267. My own notes were made from copies of the works cited in the British Museum and the University Library, Cambridge. The verses were in very many languages. The favourite tongue was Latin, but verses were also written in Greek, English, Anglo-Saxon, Welsh, French, German, Arabic, Persian, Turkish, Ethiopic, Syriac, Phœnician, Palmyrene, Etruscan, and—Hebrew.

Of Hebrew verses there are many sets. As to the merits of these compositions it is hard to speak. The printer has usually done his worst with them, and it is therefore fair to attribute some of the lameness and grotesqueness of the poems to the same cause. But I enter rather fully into this matter, because it is thus possible to name a number of English Christians who must have had some knowledge of Hebrew before they could venture at all into verses in that language. Some of the writers were indeed famous scholars.

The earliest of these collections that I have seen is *Academia Oxoniensis Pietas*, addressed by the University of Oxford to James I on his accession in 1603. In this there are only a few badly jumbled words of Hebrew, but W. Thorne (Regius Professor of Hebrew) explains that his Hebrew could not be printed for lack of type ("Interserenda hoc in loco Hebraice pluribus explicata. Sed enim Typographo deerant characteres"). The Cam-

bridge volume of the same year, *Threno-thrambeuticon*, contains no Hebrew. But it is different with my next example, which comes from Cambridge. This is entitled *Musarum Cantabrigiensium Luctus et Gratulatio*, and is dated 1658. The "Mourning" is for Oliver, the "Congratulation" for his son Richard. In this volume there is a Hebrew poem by no less a person than R. Cudworth, Master of Christ's College, who had been a member of the Whitehall Conference in 1655. It is not without a shock that one finds two years later (1660) the same Dr. Cudworth addressing a "Lament and a Eulogy"—the former on the death of Charles I, the latter on the restoration of Charles II. To this same volume Thomas Smith (Chief Librarian) also contributes some Hebrew verses in the form of an anagram and acrostic. In the same year the University of Oxford produced its tribute in a volume *Britannia Rediviva*. Edward Pococke, then Professor of Hebrew and Arabic, limits himself to Arabic and Latin, but there are Hebrew verses by three hands: John Wall (Prebendary of Christ Church), R. Button (Public Orator), and Thomas Cawton of Merton College.

In 1689 William and Mary were greeted by both Universities. The *Musae Cantabrigienses* included Hebrew odes by the Hebrew Professor (V. Stubbs), and by Ellis of Christ's. A really fine poem (printed exceptionally in pointed Hebrew) by John Bagwell distinguished the *Vota Oxoniensia* of the same year. Thomas Edwards of Christ Church also has a Hebrew poem in the same collection.

The accession of Anne, it will be remembered, was the subject of part of Joseph Abendanon's poem referred to above. It may be mentioned in passing that naturally

on the accession of a new sovereign a change of name was made in the prayer for the royal family. I have in my possession a MS. of the formula as changed in the Dublin Synagogue in the reign of Anne. But the MS. contains no other points of interest. To return to the Universities. In 1702 Oxford and Cambridge presented the usual tributes. In the *Pietas et Gratulatio* of Oxford, Thomas Hyde has a Persian song with Hebrew "Epiplonema." Robert Clavering (of University College) has a *Carmen Hebraicum Compositum et Pentametrum.* No less than three others contribute Hebrew verses of a peculiarly extraordinary grotesqueness. These are J. Wallis (Magdalen College), B. Marshall (Christ Church), and "J. T." (e. *Coll. Reg. Scholaris de Taberda*). Cambridge in 1702, *Parentat et Gratulatur*, with three Hebrew poems by S. Townsend (Jesus College), P. Allix (King's), and Arthur Ashley Sykes (Corpus Christi Coll.).

In 1714, on the accession of George I, Cambridge slightly modifies its formula to *Deflet et Gratulatur.* Philip Bouquet (Professor of Hebrew) has some curious Hebrew verses, and there are others by J. Imber (Trinity Hall), L. Imber (*ibid.*), and A. Clarke (Corpus Christi Coll.). The Oxford volume (as usual *Pietas et Gratulatio*) has some fluent lines by John Gagnier (who, it may be recalled, gave the reading of the inscription on the Bodleian Bowl adopted by Tovey). J. Stephens (Christ Church), and T. Troughear (Ling. Hebr. Prelector), and W. Wilkinson also contributed Hebrew verses. In 1727 the Oxford volume contains Hebrew poems by Robert Landavensis (Regius Professor of Hebrew) and John Pettingal (Jesus College). In the Cambridge *Luctus et Gaudia*, the Hebrew Professor, Philip Bouquet, has some Hebrew verses, and there is this curiosity. The Arabic Professor

(L. Chappelow) has a *Carmen Arabicum, propter defectum Typorum, Literis Hebraicis expressum.* But by the accession of George III (1760) Cambridge had acquired Arabic type, as the new *Luctus et Gratulationes* show. Here W. Disney (Regius Professor of Hebrew) has a copy of Hebrew verses, full of misprints. Samuel Hallifax (Trinity Hall) and J. Steele (*ibid.*) also contribute Hebrew poems to the collection. The Oxford *Pietas et Gratulatio* was not published till a year later (1761). It contains five Hebrew poems by Thomas Hunt (Regius Professor of Hebrew), Benjamin Kennicott, B. Wheeler (Trinity), J. Sparrow (Lincoln), and J. Stubb. It would appear that the custom ceased with George III. There do not seem to have been any later volumes of this kind. Had Ephraim Luzzatto reached London three years before he did, he would not doubt have given us a Hebrew poem on George III's accession. He wrote a poem, however, on the arrival in England of Queen Charlotte. This was published in 1766.

A well-known Hebrew translation of "God Save the King" was evidently made by Hyman Hurwitz for the coronation of William IV. It was first published in Hurwitz's Hebrew Grammar, 1831.

Here I may make a digression to mention that in the *Pietas Acad. Cantab.* (1738), on the death of Queen Caroline, there is a set of verses of Israel Lyons, "L. S. informatur." This is the only such copy of verses by a Jew, and it possesses little merit.

There is extant "A Sermon occasioned by the Demise of our late Venerable Sovereign, King George the Third, and on the Accession of our gracious Lord, King George the Fourth, delivered at the Synagogue, Denmark Court, Strand, on Wednesday, February 16, A.M. 5580

(=1820), by Rabbi Tobias Goodman." As this is probably one of the first English sermons delivered in a London Synagogue (Goodman's English sermon of 1817 was also printed), and as, moreover, I have had no other opportunity in this essay to give such a citation, I will extract some passages which refer to the new king (pp. 18 and 19 of the pamphlet).

We are compelled, therefore, necessarily to infer from the foregoing passages, that not only the soul of our late venerated and much beloved Monarch, will survive the dissolution of its earthly tenement, but also that his *name* will be *perpetuated* in the succession of a son (whom God preserve !), King George the Fourth, worthy to become inheritor of the glories of the House of Brunswick, and likewise of the transcendent virtues and immortal honours of his illustrious sire ; under whose mild, benignant, and paternal reign the children of the house of Israel have enjoyed uninterrupted protection and security, while their dispersed and afflicted brethren have in former times groaned under the severe bondage of contumelious slavery, or suffered in the silent agony of unavailing woe, beneath the galling lash of unrelenting persecutors.

Then let us, O house of Israel ! deeply impressed as we must be, on this solemn day, and on the awful occasion of our assembling in this sanctuary, standing as we do in the august presence of the Most High God, Creator of heaven and earth, propitiate his exalted Majesty, the King of kings, the Lord of Hosts, to receive into immortal blessedness, the soul of our late lamented Monarch, and to shed the rays of his eternal glory on his illustrious successor, that he may be enabled to walk in all the ways of his pious father, in righteousness and truth ; that his reign may be prosperous, long, and happy ; and that the people of the realms over which he is appointed to rule and have dominion, may have cause every day to return thanks to the Almighty God, for having placed upon the English throne a Monarch who, conformably to the words of the holy prophet, " will do justly—and love mercy—and walk humbly with his God." Then will the Almighty's blessing be upon the land, declining commerce will again uplift his drooping head, the earth will bring forth its produce in abundance ; then will the Lord continue to hearken unto the cry of the needy, and the hungry shall be fed from the lap of plenty ;

the widow and the orphan shall be cheered, and the dejected spirit shall sing joyful praises to its Creator.

But this sermon was in no sense a "Coronation" function. For after Rabbi Tobias Goodman's address (which it will be noted is an eloquent if idealized picture of the Georges and their ways) the Prayer composed by Chief Rabbi Hirschell on the death of George III was recited. A "Coronation" Service, pure and simple, does not seem to have been held then or later, until the days of Edward VII.

I come now to the second part of this paper: What has been the Jewish influence upon the Coronation Service? If you take the "Form and Order of Service" as at first designed for the coronation of their Majesties King Edward VII and Queen Alexandra, you find it consists of nineteen sections.[1] Take away the first section, "The Preparation," i.e. the arrangements before the service; the last, "The Recess," or the order of departure of their Majesties; the section devoted to the coronation of the Queen, and the Litany and the Communion, which are of course characteristically Christian; and it is not too much to say that the rest is saturated with the Hebraic spirit. Nearly the whole of the majestic function, including both ceremonies and prayers, not only in the latest Coronation Services but in a still more marked degree in the earlier ones, to which we shall also refer, is an echo of ancient Hebrew law and custom.

Let us look at it a little closer. The "entrance into the church" is greeted with an anthem on the 122nd

[1] See D. Macleane's *The Great Solemnity of the Coronation of the King and Queen of England*, 1902; and J. E. C. Bodley's *The Coronation of Edward the Seventh*, 1903.

Psalm. "I was glad when they said unto me, We will go into the house of the Lord." What is called "the Recognition," where the Archbishop presents the King to the people, seems to be suggested by the manner in which Samuel presents Saul to Israel, and the priest Jehoiada presents the boy king Joash to the men of Judah. I do not know whether you will think there is anything indicating Jewish restiveness in the rubric regarding the sermon, concerning which it is said, "One of the bishops begins the sermon which must be short and suitable to the great occasion"—but it is remarkable that nearly all the coronation sermons were preached from Old Testament texts, or based upon Old Testament notions. The present sovereign escaped without any, but the text for Bishop Blomfield's sermon at Queen Victoria's coronation was from 2 Chron. xxxiv. 31, "And the King stood in his place (or rather on his platform) and made a covenant before the Lord, to walk after the Lord, to keep His commandments, and His testimonies, and His statutes, with all his heart and all his soul, to perform the words of the covenant which are written in this book."

Cranmer addressed the child king, Edward VI, dissuading him from the idea that his oath was taken to the Pope. "Your Majesty is God's vicegerent and Christ's vicar within your own dominions, and to see—with your predecessor Josiah—God truly worshipped and idolatry destroyed."

The text chosen by Archbishop Sharp at the coronation of good Queen Anne was, "And queens shall be thy nursing mothers," which you will admit was a very appropriate text, full of actuality, considering that Anne was the mother of seventeen children, though unfortunately only one of them lived to the age of ten years.

Every one in the least familiar with the Bible knows how much importance was attached to the king's anointment. Reference occurs to it already in the Book of Judges, in the parable of Jotham, where the trees wish to anoint a king over themselves. It was the type of God's spirit "honouring God and man." What a part has been played in every Christian monarchy by that sentence of David, "I will not stretch forth my hand against the Lord's anointed." The person of even a foreign king like Cyrus became sacrosanct, because he too was regarded as the Lord's anointed. Among no people is the reverence for the person of the sovereign greater, endued by anointment with some mystic semi-divine sanctity, than among Jews. The prescribed benediction on beholding a king is, "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast imparted of Thy glory to flesh and blood" (Ber. 58). Earthly sovereignty is a reflex of the heavenly. It is the Hebrew spirit that speaks in Shakespeare's *Richard II* :—

> "Not all the waters in the rough rude sea
> Can wash the balm from an anointed king."

The Anthem at the Anointing is from 1 Kings i. 39, 40 : "Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anointed Solomon, etc." The Archbishop makes formal reference, too, to this precedent after performing the act of Anointing.

And so we might continue. After the Anointing was the presenting of the Spurs and Sword, which ceremony, though connected with the customs of mediæval chivalry, is also reminiscent of Psalm xlv. 4, 5, "Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one, with thy glory and thy majesty. And in thy majesty ride prosperously because of truth, meekness, and righteous-

ness." The ring is placed on the fourth finger of the right hand. "Transferring of a ring is as by Pharaoh to Joseph, Ahasuerus to Haman and Mordecai, implying the imparting of royal authority. It is also typical of marriage between sovereign and his people. The choice of the fourth finger of the right hand certain since Henry VII, and is no doubt older. Macleane, p. 93, quotes *Ecclesia Restaurata*, ii. 430, by Heylin, and Rastel's reply to Jewel, 1565, "Where did you ever read that the man should put the wedding-ring upon the fourth finger of the left hand of the woman and not on the right, as had been many hundred years continued?" In Jewish marriages the ring is also placed on the right hand, but on the first finger.

Two sceptres are used: (*a*) Sceptre with cross; (*b*) rod with dove. The first signifies kingly power and justice; the second, usually called the Rod or Verge or Warder, signifies equity and mercy. As Macleane points out (p. 96), the two sceptres are combined in the insignia of the Divine Shepherd in Psalm xxiii.: "Thy rod and thy staff shall comfort me." I would also suggest Genesis xlix. 10 as a parallel. The armillæ or *bracelets*, which are of solid gold, opening by means of a hinge for the purpose of being worn on the wrist, recall a similar ornament worn by the first King of Israel. You will remember the messenger who brought to David the news of Saul's death. "And I took the crown that was upon his head and the bracelet that was on his arm, and have brought them hither to my lord" (2 Sam. i. 10).

The oath and the actual crowning need not detain us long, they are so manifestly Jewish—though not exclusively Jewish; but the most interesting point about them is that it was usually a priest who administered the oath

and who placed the crown on the King's head. The 13th section of the Coronation Service is the presenting of the Holy Bible. It was probably introduced for the first time at the coronation of William III and Queen Mary, though it may have been done earlier. Here we find one of those reversions to Old Testament or Jewish practice. This section was slightly condensed in the service as used in August 1902. In the older versions, the Jewish tone is still more pronounced. The Archbishop having said, "We present you with this Book, the most valuable thing that this world possesses. Here is Wisdom; this is the Royal Law; these are the lively Oracles of God," the words followed, "Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this Book, that keep and do the things contained therein, etc." [1]

Can one help thinking of the Deuteronomic law? We read (Deut. xvii.) that "when the King of Israel sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, he shall write him a copy of the law in a book out of that which is before the priests, the Levites; and it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear the Lord his God, to keep and do all the words of his law; that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren . . . , and that he may prolong his life in the kingdom." A still more striking parallel is to be found in the coronation of the boy-king Joash, where it is said (2 Kings xi. 12) that Jehoiada the priest "put the crown (or diadem) upon Joash and gave him the testimony; and they made him king and anointed him; and they clapped their hands and said, God save the king." In the form used before the last three coronations these texts were actually referred to.

[1] Maskell, *Mon. Rit.*, ii, 128 (Ed. 1882).

In Section XVI of the Coronation Service reference is made to the Coronation Medals, thrown among the people as largess. The oldest Coronation Medal is that of Edward VI, and this bears a curious Hebrew inscription.

I trust I shall be pardoned for briefly dwelling with a certain predilection, for which old tastes and labours must be my excuse, upon the liturgical side of the Coronation Service.

From the eighth century onwards there have been six recensions of the English Coronation Service. What strikes the Jewish reader in the perusal especially of the earlier ones is the preponderance of Old Testament phrases and allusions. Take, for instance, the following [1] from a service sometimes called the Coronation Order of Ethelred II, and certainly written before the Conquest, possibly used at the consecration of Harold and William the Conqueror. From England the consecratory prayer spread to the Continent. With certain modifications it reappears in the Coronation Service of Charles I.

O Almighty and everlasting God, Creator and Governor of Heaven and Earth, Maker and Ruler of angels and men, King of kings and Lord of lords, who didst cause Thy faithful servant Abraham to triumph over his enemies; didst give many victories to Moses and Joshua, the governors of Thy people; didst exalt Thy lowly servant David unto the height of a Kingdom, and didst save him from the lion's mouth and from the hand of the beast and of Goliath; and didst also deliver him from the evil javelin of Saul and from all his enemies; didst enrich Solomon with the unspeakable gift of wisdom and peace, graciously give ear to our humble prayers, and multiply Thy blessing upon Thy servant N., whom in lowly devotion we do elect to the Kingdom of the Angles and of the Saxons, and ever cover him with Thy powerful hand, that he, being strengthened with the faith of Abraham, endued with the mildness of Moses, armed with

[1] L. G. Wickham Legg, *English Coronation Records* (1901), p. 24.

the fortitude of Joshua, exalted with the humility of David, beautified with the wisdom of Solomon, may please Thee in all things, may always walk uprightly in the way of righteousness, may nourish and teach, defend and instruct, the church of the whole realm with the people committed to his charge, and like a mighty king minister unto them the government of Thy power against all enemies, visible and invisible, that the sceptre depart not from the royal throne of the Angles and Saxons, but by Thy help may reform their minds to the concord of true faith and peace; that being underpropped by due obedience and honoured with the condign love of this his people, he may through length of years stablish and govern by Thy mercy the height of the glory of his fathers; and being defended with the helmet of thy protection, covered with Thy invincible shield, and all clad with heavenly armour, he may gloriously triumph, and by his power both terrify infidels and bring joyful peace for those that fight for Thee; bestow on him the virtues with which Thou hast adorned Thy faithful servants, with manifold blessings, and set him on high in the government of his kingdom and anoint him with the oil of grace of the Holy Spirit, etc.

In the *Liber Regalis*—the 4th recension—used probably at the coronation of Edward II, and the basis of the Coronation Service of Charles I, there is besides this prayer a still stronger Judaic tint—"Visit him as Thou didst visit Moses in the Bush, Joshua in Battle, Gideon in the Field, Samuel in the Temple; besprinkle him with the Dew of Thy wisdom, etc."

In the oldest known service for the coronation of an English king, taken from a ninth century Pontifical, after the staff has been given into the King's hand, the old Pentateuchal blessing is pronounced almost word for word as it occurs in Gen. xxvii. 28, 29, and xlix. 25, 26. "Almighty God give thee of the dew of heaven, and the fatness of the earth, and plenty of corn and wine; let people serve thee, and nations bow down to thee: blessed be he that blesseth thee, and God shall keep thee, and the Almighty shall bless thee with the blessing of Heaven

above, on the mountains and on the hills, blessings of the deep that lieth under, blessings of the breasts, and of grapes and fruit : blessings of the fathers of old, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, shall be upon thy head " (Wickham Legg, p. 11).

The Coronation Order of Charles I uses almost the same words. When the King has been girt with his sword he is exhorted to remember (Legg, 260) " of whom the Psalmist did prophesy, saying, Gird thee with thy sword upon thy thigh, O thou most mighty, and with this sword exercise thou the force of equity and mightily destroy the growth of iniquity, protect the Church of God and His faithful people, and pursue Heretics no less than Infidels."

In the Coronation Order of James II (*ib.* 302), the pursuit of heretics no less than infidels was for obvious reasons not demanded of the King.

Again, what could be more Jewish in language and spirit than this (Wickham Legg, p. 257), which occurs in the *Liber Regalis*—the 4th recension used in Latin at the coronation of Edward II, and (in English) at the coronation of Charles I. " The Archbishop (*Vere dignum et justum est*) : It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, holy Father, Almighty and everlasting God, the strength of the chosen and the exalter of the humble, who in the beginning by the pouring out of the flood didst chasten the sin of the world, and by a dove conveying an olive branch didst give a token of reconcilement unto the earth ; and again didst consecrate Thy servant Aaron a priest by the anointing of oil and afterwards by the effusion of oil didst make kings and prophets to govern Thy people Israel, and by

the voice of the prophet David didst foretell that the countenance of the Church should be made cheerful with oil. We beseech Thee, Almighty Father, that by the fatness of Thy creature, Thou wilt vouchsafe to bless and sanctify Thy servant (*N.*) (Charles), that in the simplicity of a dove he may minister peace unto his people, that he may imitate Aaron in the service of God; that he may attain the perfection of government, in council and in judgment, and that by the anointing of this oil Thou mayest give him a countenance always cheerful and amiable, to the whole people, etc."

In reading these passages, and many others might be cited, one can almost imagine them the work of some deft constructor of a *Piyut* mosaic. Old Testament allusions are everywhere predominant. In the latest recensions the order of service has undergone considerable change, as well as compression here and there; but the Hebraic character still pervades the ceremony and the liturgy, though happily no one regards this in the light of an alien invasion.

And so the last coronation, like the first, draws from Hebrew sources, and is informed with the Hebrew spirit of righteousness. But never was there a greater call for that spirit than now. For our sovereign is crowned king over the greatest empire on earth. That empire is made up of many races and creeds. It can only hold together if, while they mutually tolerate each other, the sovereign also, himself of one religion, respects, protects, and honours them all.

"A just ruler of men," said a King of Israel, "one that ruleth in the fear of God, will be as the light of morning, when the sun riseth, even a morning without clouds"—i.e. not shining brightly and cheeringly on some, and

casting a dark shadow upon others, but irradiating all alike with the impartial beams of his royal solicitude.

That, I believe, is already, and will continue to be the result to Jews among others of the last coronation.

[NOTE.—In the fifth volume of the *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society*, the Latin documents here cited will be printed. There will also be appendices on the Hebrew accounts of the Coronation of Richard I, on the legend of the Coronation Stone, and on the Coronation Medal of Edward VI.]

SOME CURIOSITIES OF RELIGIOUS CONTROVERSY

(*Presidential Address before the Birmingham Jewish Young Men's Association, December* 16, 1900.)

Societies like yours are generally governed by the rule that subjects of a controversial character are to be avoided. The rule has a certain plausibility, but I am not sure that it is as admirable as it seems. Many vital problems are controversial; things on which we are all agreed are not always the things which most need presentation. To avoid the debatable is to blunt the edge of truth. We must be a little braver. Judaism at the present moment stands in dire need of courageous out-spokenness. I cannot say that I acquiesce in the reluctance of Jewish Societies to permit the discussion of religious questions. If these Societies are to be a living force in the community, they must freely, though reverently, probe living issues. Controversy need not be identical with dissension or vulgarity.

This preamble need not alarm you. My address will not be controversial. It will illustrate controversy, not contribute to it. Examples of religious controversies and the methods by which they have been conducted—to this I shall rigidly confine myself.

The subject is, of course, one for which more illustrations could be adduced than I could hope to exhaust if I had a dozen opportunities of addressing you. Think

only how many kinds of controversialists there are! There are first of all the controversialists who have conducted their debates on lines of perfect mutual fairness. To treat of them would, it is true, occupy us but a short time; their numbers are not unmanageably large. To seek the truth and to follow it wherever it leads is an ideal possible to few. Preconception in our own favour and against our opponent's case—this is our usual state of mind. And so, most controversialists belong to the biassed, the passionate, the self-satisfied, the self-righteous, or the irritating. There are the controversialists who always argue and never reason. There are the microscopic controversialists who inspect the mite but cannot comprehend the heaven.

And how many methods of controversy there are! There is the method which takes it for granted that the other side is endowed with a double dose of original sin, or is at the least saturated with the quintessence of hopeless folly. There is the thumb-screw, the faggot and stake method—a favourite in days gone by—more forcible than convincing; there is the social persecution method, still in vogue and often extremely effective in its operation; and there is the latest, the coaxing method, of which our friends the conversionists have grown so fond—of all of these we Jews have had experience, and may this experience teach us to avoid them ourselves!

The interest about all genuine controversy lies in this. Say what we will, Man is a fighting animal. Fights for or about some truth have in them a dignity and merit assuredly not inferior to fights about territory, indemnities, open ports, spheres of political and commer-

cial influence. Whether Israel should worship God or Baal was at least as important a debate as whether Czar or Mikado should hold Port Arthur. But I must pass over the Biblical controversies, although greatly tempted to dwell on them, if only because the very first controversy on record is to be found in the early pages of Genesis, when the serpent started a debate with our mother Eve—in which, I regret to say, Eve, owing no doubt to the inexperience of youth, was worsted.

However, in a Society like this it will be pardonable if I take my first illustrations from the Talmud.

The Talmud is a book, or rather it is a library, usually regarded as made up of controversial matter. This is not quite true, but it is near enough to be characteristic. In itself controversy is the means to arrive at truth. "The rivalry of the scribes increases wisdom" is a Talmudic maxim. This maxim shows a profound knowledge of human nature in general, and of the character of scholars in particular. When, over and above a genuine desire to reach the facts, you have also the ambition to win a personal triumph—and the two aims are not inconsistent—then your effort has a keenness, there is behind it a driving power, which in most minds is not provided by impersonal, abstract love of truth. Yet the controversies of the schools are not in any sense ignoble, for the Talmud reveals no trace of a striving after victory for the mere sake of victory. Besides these technical discussions between Jew and Jew, the Talmud contains also not a few examples of controversy between Jews and non-Jews, in which it must be confessed it is not the Jewish controversialist who comes off second best. It is hardly consistent with human nature to expect any party to

record its own discomfitures. You may remember how in *Candide*, after a sanguinary fight, each side retires to sing its Te Deum. So, turning from fiction to history, were you to read Nachmanides' account of his great thirteenth century Disputation and to follow it up by reading the official Dominican account of the same, you would certainly think you were perusing narratives of two entirely different episodes.

The favourite topic of discussion between the doctors of the Talmud and their cultured contemporaries among the heathen turned upon the fundamental ideas concerning God which it has been Israel's mission to disseminate in the world.

Thus R. Gamliel is asked. "You assert that in each of the many places in which ten Israelites assemble for worship, there is the Shechinah, the Divine Presence. How many divinities then are there?"—"Come," answered the Rabbi, "and watch the sun's rays; they can be seen from every part of the earth. How many suns are there? Yet the sun is but one of God's servants. What is possible for the servant is surely possible for his lord" (Sanhedrin, 39).—A Roman lady argues with R. José. "Whose God is greater?" She happened to be one who worshipped an idol under the form of a serpent. "My God must be greater than yours," she said. "When Moses was on Sinai, and God appeared to him, he was able to keep in his place, merely veiling his eyes; but, when his rod became a serpent, he stepped back in fear."—"Nay," replied the Rabbi, "he could flee from your God; a few steps would be enough to put him in safety from a serpent. But how can a man escape from our God? Whither could Moses flee from Him? to the sea? to the dry land? to

the heavens ?—from Him who hath said of Himself : Do I not fill the heavens and the earth ? " (Midrash Rabba, Exodus ch. iii.).

An interesting subject of debate was the question why, considering the evil of which false gods are declared to be the cause, the true God did not put an end to them. " Why," so began a lively controversy between a Gentile philosopher and R. Gamliel, " why is not your God as zealous against the idols as against the idolaters ? " Replied the Rabbi : " A king had an only son, who proved a most undutiful child. The prince had a dog whom he called after his father's name ; whenever he was excited he would swear by the life of the dog, his father. Now with whom ought the king to have been wroth ; with the dog or with his son ? Surely with the son. So, with whom should God strive, with the idol or with its worshipper ? "—" But," returned the other, " there must be something in these idols, for there was once a fire in our city which consumed the whole place with the exception of the Temple with its gods, which alone was saved from the flames." The Rabbi answered ironically : " When a king goes to war, with whom does he fight, with the dead or with the living ? " —" But," said the other, " the chief question is, why does not your true God put an end to the false gods ? " —" Perhaps because among other things that are worshipped are sun and moon and stars. Is God to destroy His whole world to keep fools from their folly ? "—" Well, let Him destroy the other objects that are worshipped and that are not so important."—" Seest thou not, that if the minor things were destroyed because they are worshipped, the major things would be worshipped because they are not destroyed ? "—The

whole argument amounted to this, that it is not by any change from without, but by the change from within, that reformation of heart must be effected. How much futile waste of words and of temper might be spared if controversialists would only remember that elementary fact!

Here is an example of a curious debate which, I believe, will commend itself to my sisters. To Rabban Gamliel's house there came a certain sceptic. "Your God," said the sceptic, "is a thief. Your own Bible reports that when Adam was asleep, God took a rib from him." While R. Gamliel was pondering a reply, his daughter came up to him and whispered, "Leave the caviller to me." "Sir," she said suddenly; "lead me to a judge. I must see a judge."—"Why, what has happened?"—"A thief has broken into our house and has stolen our silver goblet."—"Has he left any traces?"—"Yes," she replied, "he has; he has left a golden goblet in its place."—"Ah!" exclaimed the sceptic, "would that there came thieves like that to one's house every night."—"You think it a fair exchange? Well, then, what must Adam have thought when, as you say, a rib was stolen from him, and in place of it he found his beautiful Eve?" So far the story as it appears in the Talmud (Sanh. 39a). Elsewhere (Genesis Rabba, ch. xvii.) there is an addition. "But," went on the sceptic (in the second version the speaker is again our old friend the Roman matron), "why was the exchange made secretly?" The Rabbi's daughter had her answer. "So that Eve might for the first time appear before Adam in all the glory of her perfect beauty."

Apart from their intensely religious natures, those

old Talmudic doctors had a gift of common sense in matters of controversy for which they are not always given full credit, and which I do not think is always conspicuously present in their modern representatives. Take this illustration, brimful of instruction for those who have a mind thereto (Baba Mezia, 59b). It should be remembered that the story I am about to relate belongs to the second century. This was a period when people's notions of what constituted evidence were not such as would commend themselves to us, and when miracles, apparitions, and mysterious voices were frequent in proportion to the eagerness with which they were expected. Now, Rabbi Eliezer had been laying down the law in regard to a number of religious questions with much dexterity and acumen. Many wise men were present, and despite R. Eliezer's skill in argument and the display of some vehemence on his part, the sages were not convinced. Thereupon R. Eliezer adopted another style of reasoning. "To prove that I am right," he said, "let this carob tree decide." Such a tree was growing near the place where they were gathered, and the tree forthwith moved one hundred yards from its place. Some say it moved four hundred yards; it is not easy, you will observe, to obtain precise agreement in the reports of such portents. The sages replied, "Carob trees prove nothing." Then said Rabbi Eliezer, "If the law is as I say, let this running stream flow backward." And the stream flowed backward. But the sages said that nothing can be proved by movement of a stream. Wrong is not right even if the water reverses its course. "To show that I am right, let the walls of this house of study decide." Hardly had Rabbi Eliezer appealed

to the walls, when they began to totter and threatened to fall. Thereupon, Rabbi Joshua exclaimed to the walls: "If the sages dispute with one another in matters of the Torah, how does that concern you, O walls?" And the walls fell not, out of regard to R. Joshua; nor would they stand quite perpendicular, out of regard to R. Eliezer.—Once again R. Eliezer resumed the attack: "Let the heavens decide." Then was heard a Daughter of the Voice (*Bath Kol*) from above, a mysterious echo sounding from afar, saying: "How can ye differ from R. Eliezer, the law being indeed as he says." But, with firmness as with reverence, up rose R. Joshua, and thus spake he: "Moses has taught us that the Law is no longer in heaven. Since it was given to man on Sinai, the earth is its home. Not with a *Bath Kol* rests the decision, but with the majority, according to the teaching of the Law itself that it is the majority that decides." And so it must. For though Goethe said, "Die Mehrheit ist die Dummheit," it is after all the consensus of reasoned opinion that must carry the world with it in the end.

Besides the saving common sense of Talmudical controversy, there is another admirable feature of it: it is wonderfully good-humoured. Men differed from one another often in a very lively fashion, but in differences with men of other or of no religion there was very little bitterness. Even in controversies with their own brethren and those of their own religion—with whom it is notorious that people always quarrel most fiercely, according to the rule that the nearer things are to each other the greater the friction and the intenser the heat evolved—even in what one might call family disputes, there was no hostile after-feeling.

The numerous controversies between the Schools of Hillel and Shammai (Hillel and Shammai themselves are said to have differed only on three points) have left their mark on Jewish opinion and custom. Fierce enough while they lasted, these controversies left no bitterness rankling in the heart of either party. Though they could not both have their own way, such was the tolerance of olden days, that it came to be said: "These and those spoke the words of the living God." At the beginning of one of the ancient Rabbinic books (the *Aboth* of Rabbi Nathan) there is recorded a noble sentiment which is typical of all these disputes and should be an example to ours. "They who sat and occupied themselves with the Torah (Scripture) were zealous against each other in argument; but when they parted they were as though they had been life-long friends."

Then, again, there was rarely any superciliousness on the part of opponents in the Talmudic discussions. The Rabbis, truly, had a contempt for the ignoramus. But you will scarcely find among them the tone of Epictetus. The latter was a Stoic philosopher who lived in the first century of the Christian era. In one of his discourses he refuses point-blank even to discuss questions with a certain visitor. "Why," asks Epictetus, "should I try to speak to *you*; what can *you* understand? There is an art of hearing as well as an art of speaking; you have not learned how to hear." There is deep truth in this, which is paralleled in the fiery sentence with which Carlyle closes his *History of the French Revolution*: "It stands ill with me if I have spoken falsely: thine (O Reader) also it was to hear truly." If it takes two people to differ, it takes two to agree.

For a true controversy there must be not merely honesty but understanding on both sides. Given this preliminary, controversy would end; without it, controversy is waste of time.

The same friendliness which characterized Rabbinic disputation marks also the earlier controversies between Jews and Christians. This curiosity of controversy—for it is unhappily a curiosity when religious polemics are conducted amicably—is nowhere more fully illustrated than in a famous discussion of the second century of the Christian era. I refer to Justin Martyr's, "Dialogue with Tryphon." Justin, the Church Father, was born in Palestine about the year 100; he was put to death in Rome some sixty or seventy years later. His birthplace was Shechem, then called Flavia Neapolis, now known as Nablus. Justin, though born in the Samaritan environment, did not belong to the Samaritan sect, and his first inclinations were towards Platonism, which he left for Christianity. In one of his morning walks in the Xystus of Ephesus, Justin, arrayed in philosopher's garb, was accosted respectfully by Tryphon, who described himself as a Jew who had escaped from the Bar Cochba war (135) and was spending his days in Greece, chiefly at Corinth. They fall into philosophic talk, which soon merges into an argument as to the relative truth of Christianity and Judaism. The manner as well as the matter is obsolete; the studied politeness on both sides is as much a thing of the past, as the questions of Biblical interpretation. Much of the dispute turns on the Messianic passages in the Hebrew Bible and their Christological interpretation. Then there is the perennial difference of opinion as to life under the law; to Justin the Jewish Code is a

penalty, to Tryphon a glory. Justin holds that the law and its rites were given to Israel only because of Israel's sins, and to wean Israel from idolatry. Thus Justin takes almost the same view of the sacrifices as Maimonides did later on ; they were not meant to be a permanent expression of man's devotion, but were intended educationally. To prevent sacrifices to idols, sacrifices to God were sanctioned rather than ordained. Justin does not put the theory quite in the Maimonist terms, but the two writers are in essential agreement. Driven to prove the divinity of Jesus from the Hebrew Scriptures, Justin urges that the Jews had tampered with the sacred text which originally contained clear proofs of the Christian case. As Otto, Justin's editor truly puts it, the passages which Justin misses from the Hebrew text were not removed by Jews but added by Christians. At all events, for this charge of tampering with the Hebrew text, repeated again and again in controversial literature, there is no foundation whatever. It is saddening to find that later on Mohammedans accused Christians of doing the very thing which Christians laid to the charge of Jews. This is a Nemesis which often befalls men and nations. The charge of ritual murder, made so malignantly against Jews by European Christians in the middle ages, has in recent times been made in China against Christians. When the Black Death decimated Europe in the fourteenth century, the Jews were accused of poisoning the wells ; in India nowadays, the plague is popularly ascribed to similar malignity on the part of English Christians ! Libels like curses come home to roost. And thus was it also with the less heinous, but not less painful charge of tampering with the text of Scripture. The Rabbis

felt that there were expressions in Scripture which they could have wished had been otherwise worded; see, for instance, the instructive list in the Talmud, Megillah 9a. These expressions are mainly anthropomorphic, but the Massoretic Bible shows how scrupulously the Rabbis avoided introducing any emendation into the text. As to Justin, he was quite ignorant of Hebrew. But this did not prevent him from imagining himself competent to discuss readings and etymologies of a text he could not read. Justin's exposition of Scripture is moreover of the "typical" order, in which almost any phrase may typify almost any thing that you want typified. Nothing in the whole history of Judæo-Christian controversy is more lamentable than its uselessness for getting to the true meaning of the Bible. The Jews were sometimes tempted to deny the Messianic meaning of certain passages because the Christians applied them to a particular person; the Christians were tempted to seize upon phrases, which meant quite another thing in the true context, and force them into confirmations of their views. One side might refuse to read what was there, because the other side insisted on reading what was not there. It was different with the Karaite controversy within Judaism. The Karaites, denying tradition, were driven to the Scriptures; the Rabbinite Jews, in answer to the Karaites, were forced to search the Scriptures likewise. I do not assert that the controversy was always fair; it was not always polite. But it did produce a scientific exegesis; it gave us the beginnings of that true exposition of the Hebrew Bible which culminated in Kimchi. On the other hand the Judæo-Christian disputes produced only bad exegesis and bad temper.

But, as we have seen, this was not so at first, at least as regards the temper. Justin and Tryphon were models of fairness and good manners. Who Tryphon was it is impossible to say. Some think that there never was such a person, but the Dialogue is too circumstantial to be fictitious. Justin may have adopted the name of a celebrated Rabbi (Tarphon) who was perhaps still alive, and who was known to be a cordial opponent of the new religion. But Justin does not describe his interlocutor as a famous Rabbi; it is Eusebius who makes this assertion. Rabbi Tarphon was born before the destruction of the Temple (70); and, after 135, when the Dialogue took place, would have been at least seventy years of age. It is therefore highly improbable that Tarphon can be meant, though Graetz assumed, with some plausibility, the identity of Tryphon with Tarphon. Tarphon, we should have expected, would have made a more skilful disputant. The work of the Church Father is not, however, without its value, for it gives us authentic information on many points of Jewish opinion with regard to the interpretation of Isaiah and the Psalms; it cites ritual customs as well as homiletical discourses; sometimes, we may hope, his report is inaccurate. Thus he asserts that in this day Jews were allowed to marry four or five wives, and were on the whole lax in their marital morals. This statement is not confirmed by other evidence, and it is at least inconsistent of Justin, in another part of the Dialogue, to represent the marriages of Jacob as in part typical of the Church. But it is pleasant to turn to Justin's kindly feeling towards his opponent. He tells Tryphon that when he writes out their discussions he will take pains to present Tryphon's

case fairly and faithfully. He is always anxious to avoid wounding Tryphon's feelings. In one place Tryphon becomes angry at Justin's use of the Scriptures, and he exclaims with some irritation: "The utterances of God are holy, but your explanations are blasphemous."—"And I," continues Justin, "wishing to get him to listen to me, answered in milder tones, thus: I admire, Sir, this piety of yours." Such courtesies are among the most agreeable of the curiosities of debate. Tryphon is not behindhand with his compliments. In another part of the interview Justin remarks that he (Justin) is not gifted with oratorical power. "You must be jesting," retorts Tryphon; "your conversation proves you a past master in rhetoric." But it is the end that is so delightful. Tryphon, and those of his fellow-Jews who had joined him after the first day, part from Justin with expressions of respect and kindliness. Then Tryphon, after a little pause, said: "You see it was not intentionally that we came to discuss these points. And I confess that I have been particularly pleased with the conference, and I think that these are quite of the same opinion as myself. For we have found more than we expected—more than it was possible to expect. And if we could confer more frequently, we should be much helped in our search of the Scriptures. But since you are on the eve of departure, and expect daily to sail, do not hesitate to remember us as friends after you are gone."—"For my part," Justin replies, "I would have wished to do the same daily." Separating with mutual respect, with the conviction that each side had learned something from the other, this is assuredly an ideal ending to a not quite ideal discussion.

Such friendly intercourse between Jews and Christians, with a resultant humaneness in controversial amenities, did not continue. With the growing power and, it must be added, energy of the Church, and the persistent "stiffneckedness" and protestantism of the Jews, there intruded a lamentable bitterness on both sides. Each side hurt the other; the one by trying to convert, the other by refusing to be converted. Still, Origen in the third century fought dogmas not their exponents, principles not principals. We are all inclined to abuse the man, not weigh the cause. With Eusebius the tone of animosity becomes established, and Ephraem Syrus (fourth century) terms the Jews "circumcised vagabonds." Judaism should have died under its heavy tribulations, but the Church Father in Edessa was forced to witness the Rabbinic development in Babylonia which was then giving us the Talmud. Ephraem wonders that the Jews still hope, just as Jerome tells them that their miserable condition proves them aliens from the Divine favour. This is a recurrent argument, and it seems a little cruel and more than a little unchivalrous to use the low estate of the Jews as an instrument for weakening their allegiance to their ideals. These controversialists displayed a surprising ignorance of the psychology of human nature. It is the contrite heart and broken spirit that draw men to the ideal, and spirits are made contrite and hearts broken by suffering, not by prosperity. Fidelity to Judaism was strengthened, not weakened, by the "sufferings of love" inflicted by the hand of God, and the "sufferings of wrath" imposed by man could not prevail. Against the argument alluded to, Jehuda Halevi in his *Cuzari*, and Maimon (father of Maimonides) in his *Letter of*

Consolation, protested. The best reply was that of Joseph Kimchi, in the twelfth century. The permanent worth of Judaism was provable not by the happiness of the Jews but by their morality. Just so in the eighteenth century, Lessing in the parable of the three rings (a parable which has its analogue in the Midrash), held that the test of a religion is its power to produce in its devotees ideals of character and beauties of life. As Richard Baxter put it: "While we wrangle here in the dark, we are dying and passing to the world that will decide all our controversies, and the safest passage thither is by peaceable holiness." To go back to Jerome, a curiosity of his argumentation is his complaint that Christian students were charged high fees by their Jewish tutors! As early as Jerome (about the year 400), we find Jews compelled to attend sermons with the avowed object of inducing them to join the dominant creed—a curiosity of controversy which persisted till a quite recent date in Rome. One of the complaints of the early Church Fathers, a complaint again and again repeated, is that the Jews would not keep to the point in their debates. They were always flying off to side issues. Possibly the Jews tried to evade giving such replies as would be what must to a Christian appear blasphemous. But the complaint goes deeper. This is a genuine fault of the Jewish mind. It lacks concentration.

Were I writing a history of Jewish Polemics, it would be necessary to interpolate here an extended reference to the struggle within Judaism which arose from the formation of the Karaite Sect. Sectarian differences have not been, on the whole, of great moment in Judaism. The Sadducean opposition to Pharisaism, like the

Karaite antagonism to Rabbinism, hardly affected the general current. In the eighth century, Anan founded the Karaite Sect which set its face against the traditions of the Synagogue. At first the Geonim—or leaders of the traditional Judaism—seem to have thought that the heresy could be vanquished by ignoring it. This is often an effective method, but in this instance it failed. Karaism was in its very essence an aggressive and controversial movement, and it carried on an active campaign which was not checked by the Gaonic silence. It was not till the era of Saadiah (892–942) that the Rabbinites met attack with defence and counter-attack. In Moses de Rieti's phrase, Saadiah opened for himself the gates of Paradise by his meritorious onslaught upon Anan's tenets. A disagreeable feature of the controversy was the personal abuse indulged in by both sides. Anan, in the legend, is said to have wished that he could include in his own person all the learned Rabbis, so that by a single stroke of the sword he could slay them all with himself. This is the real controversial truculence. Saadiah and his opponents did not use swords, but they flung abuse at each other. The Gaon called Sakaweihi "novice," "ignoramus"; and the other side politely retaliated by alluding to Saadiah as "that fellow." But, as hinted above, this struggle did produce at least one good result. It promoted, if it did not create, a true scientific Hebrew philology and exegesis. I have said that no such good result emanated from Judæo-Christian disputes. I must, however, except Origen's *Hexapla*, a famous collation of the Greek versions of the Scriptures, which collation grew out of Origen's desire to meet the controversial charge that the Church

relied on an inaccurate text. Similarly, the Authorized Version of the Bible in English was a result of disputes between Anglicans and Dissenters in the time of James I. Controversy does occasionally produce these good fruits, and it is a pleasure to dwell on this aspect of our subject. And to return to the Karaites, it is refreshing to find that Maimonides is reputed to have conquered them by love. We find some touching instances of mutual forbearance between the two bodies which cannot fail to call forth our admiration. Thus there is extant in Cambridge a marriage settlement of the year 1082 between a Rabbinite bridegroom and a Karaite bride. In it the husband promises not to compel his wife to sit in the light of a lamp on Friday nights—a point on which the Karaites were curiously sensitive ; nor will he ask her to eat food forbidden by the Karaite law, nor require her to profane the festivals as fixed by the Karaite Calendar. On her part, the wife convenants to observe with her husband the festivals as fixed by the Rabbinite Calendar (See Dr. Schechter's article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, XIII. 218).

Any account of the curiosities of controversy would be imperfect, that did not dwell, however briefly, upon the public contests which were forced in the Middle Ages on our reluctant fathers, were invariably attended by bitterness, and followed by aggravated suffering and persecution, without ever advancing by one inch the interests of true religion.

We have already seen that in the early centuries of the Christian era, discussions were common between Christians and Jews. We have seen how the tone of these discussions deteriorated with the course of time.

Church Councils were able to give a practical turn to hostility by anti-Jewish legislation, and this tended to embitter controversy still further. But there was one consideration which kept disputation within bounds. There was a general feeling that the Jews were too learned and too skilful in argument to be meddled with in a light-hearted spirit. Throughout the controversial literature of the earlier period we catch this tone. It was an act of temerity to argue with Jews. As late as the thirteenth century, French Rabbis like Nathan Official and his son Joseph the Zealot, won wide repute for their skill as debaters. They had frequent wordy encounters with chiefs of the Church, including Pope Gregory X, and were allowed the utmost freedom of speech. On one occasion, failing in his attempt to persuade Nathan of the Christological meaning of the " star " of Numbers xxiv. 17, Pope Gregory asked : " Tell me, then, the explanation you give of the passage. Tell it me as a friend."

But a different spirit came permanently in, when the lead in such disputations was taken by baptized Jews. These men were sometimes possessed of learning, and they were able to make a fair show in debate. But they chiefly used their knowledge to wrap a cloak of plausibility round malicious libels. Having left Judaism, they were eager to prove the genuineness of their zeal for their present religion by the fierceness of their rancour against their former religion. Being on with the new love, they were very much off with the old. There have been and there are conspicuous exceptions. Two Christians who had been Jews—Cassel and Chwolson—were vigorous defenders of the Jews against nineteenth century anti-Semitism. More

often the seceder has become an accuser than an advocate. Such men have been disappointed that their example has not proved contagious; they seem to have anticipated a wholesale following of their lead. When this hope failed, they turned on their reluctant brethren. They collected every phrase in the Jewish liturgy and ferreted out every expression in the Agada that was, or could be distorted into, an attack on Christianity. Every declination in the Jewish law from perfect tolerance to alien beliefs was seized upon as a whip for the backs of the Jews. Charges were formulated which the Jews were challenged publicly to answer. If they were unwilling to reply, judgment went by default. But they were not left to choose their own alternative. Reply they must, though the verdict preceded the trial. If in the warmth of debate a word was unwarily uttered against the dominant dogmas, it was blasphemy, and the guilt of the Jews became deeper in the very effort to prove themselves innocent. Sometimes the discussion would be cut short by the intervention of a knightly sword, which cleft in twain the head of the disputant whose reasoning it was found impossible to vanquish. This was the method of controversy recommended by St. Louis.

In the first half of the thirteenth century a public disputation was held in Paris. Nicholas Donin had been excommunicated by Rabbi Yechiel of Paris with public formalities, and after ten years of isolation, he joined the Franciscan Order. In 1238 Gregory IX, before whom Donin preferred charges of Talmudic blasphemy, issued instructions to the princes of the Church and to the kings of France, Spain, Portugal and England to confiscate all the copies

of the Talmud they could lay hands on, and deliver them over to the Monks, who were to examine into the contents of the books, and treat them as their contents deserved. In England, Spain and Portugal no attention was paid to the order. But France was more accommodating. A public disputation was arranged, to be held in Paris in presence of the Queen-Mother. Yechiel was chosen as the spokesman of the Jews and was called upon by Donin to defend the Talmud against charges of blasphemy. Two years later twenty-four cart-loads of copies of the Talmud were consigned to the flames. I omit the argument, for it is quite irrelevant to the issue. Donin had resolved to burn the Talmud, and burnt it was. More important was another disputation of this kind held in Barcelona in 1263. Here another Jewish-Christian, Pablo Christiani, compelled Nachmanides to meet him in public debate. Again the function was graced by royal auditors. The interesting feature of Nachmanides' advocacy of the Jewish cause was his bold refusal to be held to all the Agadic statements of the Talmud. These, said Nachmanides, were personal opinions of individuals; they were not tenets of Judaism. When Nachmanides published his outspoken addresses, the King, who had promised his protection, felt unable to harbour him. Nachmanides was forced to fly for his life. Yet more famous was a third disputation, held amid unparalleled pomp in Tortosa in 1413. This resulted in a Papal Bull forbidding the study of the Talmud, and commanding Christians to abstain from intercourse with Jews.

One sometimes wonders what it was that men of sense, such as many of the higher clergy were, expected

as the result of such discussions. The subjects debated were fit for the study not the arena. Grave theologians might enter with advantage into intricate questions of Biblical exegesis and recondite problems of religious history. But how should such matters be satisfactorily discussed before an ignorant auditory of the masses? It is by no means a pleasing thought that Jews themselves have at times carried their own internal dissensions before the tribunal of the crowd. In the Maimunist controversy as to the lawfulness of studying philosophy; in the Eybeschütz imbroglio as to the Altona Rabbi's alleged heretical amulets; in some lamentable instances connected with the recent struggles between Orthodoxy and Reform; Jews have appealed to outsiders to settle matters which concerned only themselves. No comment of mine could add to the condemnation which the bare record of this fact pronounces. Now and then the appeal to public opinion is salutary and useful. In the case of that extraordinary satire the *Epistolæ Virorum Obscurorum* the effect was decisive for good. Here the friends of the revival of learning poured such ridicule on the Obscurantists that the latter were glad to sink into ignominious seclusion. A Reuchlin was enabled to rescue the literature of Judaism from the hands of a Pfefferkorn. Then again, Swift's *Battle of the Books* was another case in which an intricate philological dispute was thrown before the inexpert public with noble results so far as the gaiety of a people was concerned. But, for the most part, in public disputes, in which rival champions face each other before an irreverent and jeering crowd, the cause of truth can only be injured, for both sides are brought into equal contempt. Yet it is clear that these mediæval discussions were

meant for the masses. The debates were launched not so much in the expectation of vanquishing the Jews as of prejudicing them. Or there may have been another motive. A new Rector was once appointed to a certain Church. He was young and zealous and had heard that there were many serious faults among his congregation. He was determined to do his best to remedy them. He began by preaching against drink. "My dear Rector," remonstrated a leading layman, "you must not do that. Do you not know that the foundation stone of our Church was laid by the great brewer of the district, the head of the firm of Hopps & Malting?" On the next Sunday he spoke against extravagance. The congregation stood aghast. "Don't you know that the wife of our junior Churchwarden is the best, or at least the most extravagantly, dressed woman in the parish, and that her attendance at our Church is a great draw?" Then he denounced betting. "You have done a nice thing! Why one of our staunchest supporters is a great turfite; he built the steeple for us out of his winnings when Weathercock won by a neck." In despair the young Rector demanded: "Against *whom* then may I preach?" The reply was prompt. "Against the Jews. No one will interfere or be anything but gratified. Do not hesitate. It is always safe to preach against the Jews." Perhaps some such feeling lay at the bottom of the mediæval disputations. Shakespeare describes for us the King who went to war to divert his subjects' attention from misrule at home. Possibly the Monks felt that they might similarly turn men's minds from the faults of the Church by directing them to the faults of the Synagogue.

Two classes of controversial converts have been

mentioned above. The one class attacks, the other defends, the old religion. But there is a third class, which whips old and new religions alike. The class is monopolized by a single individual—Heinrich Heine. He did not cease to be a Jew, for he never was one ; he did not, on his baptism, become a Christian, for he never ceased to be a Jew. This is part of the paradox of his character. In one of his poems—" Disputation "—he has provided one of the most extraordinary of all curiosities of controversy. It is full of wisdom as of wit, and of irreverence as of both these qualities put together. But it does accurately hit the mark of futility. With immortal effrontery and unequalled penetration it exposes the absurdity of the mediæval debates. It is impossible to do justice to the satire in a mere summary ; only a Heine can interpret a Heine.

It is at Toledo, and the bells clang to a tourney. Speeches are the only spears, the heroes are no knightly Paladins. Rabbi and Monk enter the lists, helmeted in Sabbath-cap and cowl, armoured in Arbakanfess and Scapulary. Rabbi Judah is pitted against Friar Joseph ; and each side, confident of victory, holds ready its instrument of conversion. An impatient crowd fills the arena. Under a golden canopy sit King and Queen, Pedro and Blanca. He is called the " Cruel," but looks better than his fame. Blanche de Bourbon is a beauty. Heine pictures her with her French *retroussé* nose, the drollery in her eyes, the charm of her smiling lips. She is a lovely and fragile flower, transplanted. The Monk leads off, blustering and pleading alternately. First he exorcises the Rabbi, for the Devil is said to furnish the Jews with ready wit for such encounters. Then he enunciates the

Trinity, "a mystery only clear to him who frees himself from the cramping chains of Reason." But the Monk soon leaves dogma. He turns a flood of abuse upon his antagonist: foul carcass filled with legions of the damned, hyæna and rhinoceros, vampire and raven, basilisk and gallows-bird—these are but a few specimens of the Monk's epithets. "Yes!" he shouts, "our God is Love, and in meekness and kindness *we* emulate Him. Therefore are we so calm and so tender to you." The party of the Monk get the water ready for the Rabbi's baptism. But the "water-hating Hebrew" shrugs his shoulders. If it was difficult to reproduce the insolent sarcasm with which Heine presents the Christian case, it is still harder to summarize the wit with which he reports the Jew's reply. Most Heinesque of all is the Rabbi's description of the Leviathan feast, prepared for the righteous. "What God cooks is well cooked," says Rabbi Judah, and he insinuatingly invites the Monk to come and taste. The Monk replies in good theological Billingsgate, and the Rabbi rages too. "Smite this Atheist, O Lord," shouts the Rabbi. "May God smite thee, thou villain," retorts the Priest. Taunt and insult go on for twelve weary hours; the crowd is restless, the courtiers impatient, the maids of honour yawn. Then the King turns to the Queen under the golden awning. He asks for her verdict. Has the Rabbi or the Monk won? Passing her white hand over her whiter brow, the Queen admits that she cannot tell who is right or who wrong—but this she knows of both champions that "alle Beide stinken." This is Heine at his most characteristic. With a coarse jibe he ends his inimitable satire, and dismisses Rabbi and Monk with equal contempt. What an insight Heine shows

into the psychology of mediæval controversy; what an insight he permits us to gain into his own mind and heart!

Let me now bring before you a case calculated to stir our feelings indeed, but not to depress them—a curiosity of controversy in which the great Jewish philosopher of the eighteenth century, Moses Mendelssohn, takes part with all the dignity and nobility of character which one might expect in a modern Socrates. Born in Dessau in 1729, educated in a Cheder of his native place, he wandered, a feeble-looking, mis-shapen boy of thirteen alone to Berlin, sought a living in commerce, a higher living in the study of languages, science, history, philosophy, and religion; produced works that have done honour not only to Judaism and to German literature, but to humanity; and died in 1786, honoured and lamented by some of the greatest minds of Europe, from Immanuel Kant downwards.

At his modest lodging in Berlin, Mendelssohn, then a clerk and book-keeper, was visited by a Christian theologian, Johann Kasper Lavater. Lessing, a common friend of the two, introduced them to one another. Lavater, a highly gifted man, but with a bent towards mysticism and a profound faith in physiognomy—(he is the author of a well-known work on the subject)—was captivated by the charm of Mendelssohn's personality. Lavater wrote of him to a clerical friend in Zurich: "The Jew Moses, author of the philosophical Letters on the Emotions, we found in his office, busy with silk goods. A companionable, brilliant soul, with piercing eyes, the body of an Æsop. A man of keen insight, exquisite taste and wide erudition. He is a great venerator of all thinking minds, and himself

a metaphysician; an impartial judge of all works of talent and taste; frank and open-hearted in intercourse, more modest in his speech than in his writings, unaffected by praise, free from the tricks of meaner spirits who aim only at pushing themselves into notoriety, generous, ready to serve his friends; a brother to his brethren the Jews, affable and respectful to them, and by them honoured and beloved." A close friendship sprang up between the two men, when the desire arose in Lavater to convert his friend to Christianity. A not unnatural or unworthy vanity played its part in this ambition. What would not the educated world say if he made a spiritual conquest of the man, whose name was becoming familiar in all the cultured circles in Europe. Lavater fell into a not uncommon mistake; he imagined that a tolerant man like Mendelssohn could have no deep conviction of the truth of his own religion. He was speedily undeceived; and, repelled by solid arguments as well as the philosopher's gentle irony, Lavater abandoned the attack. But he returned to it after some years. A Geneva professor, Bonnet, had written in French a not very striking "Enquiry into the proofs of the truth of Christianity against unbelievers." This work Lavater translated into German. He prefaced it with a dedication to Mendelssohn, which was of the nature of what we may colloquially term a "plant." In it Lavater solemnly adjured Mendelssohn to refute these arguments as publicly as they were now presented, if he could; and, if he could not, "then do what wisdom, the love of truth and honesty must bid him, what a Socrates would have done if he had read the book and found it unanswerable."

In one sense Lavater did Mendelssohn no friendly

service; in another, he did both to the philosopher and his community a service vaster than he could have contemplated. For some years past Mendelssohn had been devoting his great talents to studies in criticism and to philosophical work. Now and henceforward his main interest was the cause of Judaism. He hated and shunned religious controversy: he knew the dangers he would run in replying. How could he answer Christian arguments without attacking Christianity? And how could he attack Christianity, even indirectly, without bringing further trouble on his already overburdened brethren? Then, was he not certain to offend some of his fellow-Jews, he, an enlightened Hebrew, steeped in the culture of his time, without an atom of bigotry or superstition in his nature? It is, admittedly, a thankless task to champion Judaism; Jews are certain to be ungrateful, Christians apt to take offence. It is sometimes alleged that Jews have two Judaisms—one to possess, the other to profess; one for actual use the other to use for controversy. This charge is applicable to the apologists for every creed; they put the best foot forward for public examination. But if controversy is to have any merit whatever it must be sincere. The one side must not extenuate, the other must set down naught in malice. Certainly Mendelssohn set a splendid example in this respect. Nothing more frank, more unreserved, has ever been penned than his exposition and defence of Judaism. The man's integrity shines in every line.

He really had no choice but to accept Lavater's challenge, and Lessing, too, urged him on. Reluctantly he began his task; but as he progressed he grew bolder and more determined, I had wellnigh said more inspired,

in the defence of his faith. And he produced a work which to this day remains probably the noblest and most dignified Apology for Judaism—using "Apology" in its old classical sense. The subject is worthy of a lecture by itself. I must content myself with quoting a few sentences only from Mendelssohn's reply. Christianity, he said, remained then as before impossible for him for the reason already given to Lavater orally, that the claim was set up for its founder of being divine. For my part, he went on, Judaism might have been defeated in every polemical text-book, and might have been led away in triumph in every scholastic work, yet I should not have entered the lists of my own accord. Ridicule might have been cast on it without contradiction from me. Why? Because it was my belief that the contempt entertained for the Jew is best answered by virtuous life, and not by controversial writings. My religion, my philosophy, and my standing in civil life supply me with the weightiest reasons to avoid all religious controversies, and in public writings to speak only of those truths which are of equal importance to all religions. Suppose there were living among my contemporaries a Confucius or a Solon, I could, according to the principles of my faith, love and admire the great man without falling into the ridiculous idea that I must convert a Solon or a Confucius. I am happy enough to count as friends many excellent men who are not of my faith. We love each other sincerely; never has my heart whispered to me secretly: What a pity that beautiful soul is lost! Mendelssohn in another work more fully develops this idea. He held fast to the belief that there are many ways to God, and while Judaism is the best and only way for the

Jew, it is not necessary for all the world to accept Judaism. In the essay which we are now more particularly treating, Mendelssohn goes on to give many reasons for avoiding controversy. Must he not as a Jew be content with sufferance? He turns neatly on Lavater by reminding him that in Lavater's native town, Zurich, he—Mendelssohn—would not even be allowed to pay a visit to his Christian friend. Then he proceeds to criticize the work of Bonnet, shows how weak it is, points out that much stronger arguments in favour of Christianity are to be read in English and German works, and that the whole thing was so feeble that by the same arguments any religion could be defended, quite as well or quite as badly. To talk of a Socrates being converted by such a book is to show what power prejudice may usurp over reason. He concludes his reply, which made a profound impression on all parties, with the words: "I will not deny that I have found in my religion human accretions and abuses, which unhappily dim its lustre—as happens with every religion in the course of time. But of all that is of the essence of my faith I am so firmly and so immovably convinced, that I testify herewith before the God of truth, your and my creator and preserver, by whom you have adjured me in your appeal, that I shall cleave to my principles so long as my soul does not change its nature."

It would go beyond our present range to examine Mendelssohn's other controversial writings, his preface to Menasseh ben Israel's "Vindiciæ Judæorum," his famous discussion of the essentials of Judaism entitled "Jerusalem." As one reads them one realizes what a champion for truth and light Mendelssohn was. In the very nature of the weapons he uses one is

reminded of that sword of a true and faithful knight, on which was graven the device, "Never draw me without right; never sheath me without honour."

Among the curiosities of controversy must be named the Ink-pot and Scissors method. Go into any library of older Hebrew books, open the volumes at random, and you will see passage after passage blotted out. The censors daubed with ink statements and arguments which they thought hostile to their own religion. Many a stately and costly tome has been rendered unsightly in this way. The censorship either forbade the publication of books altogether, or authorizing them conditionally, proceeded to expunge objectionable matter. The books were returned to their owners expurgated and signed by the censors. The owners had to pay the censors' fees for mutilating their property. Sometimes the acid in the ink has actually destroyed the texture of the paper; in other cases, as with many a palimpsest, the ink above has in course of time faded and the original underneath has come to the surface again. Often when this happens, the brown stain remains, revealing in instance after instance the folly and ignorance of the censor. The most harmless passages are, comically enough, sometimes mistaken for attacks on Christianity. In more recent times, especially in Russia, printer's ink is being used, and there is little hope of recovery for passages so treated. Occasionally, to save himself trouble, the censor would cut out the whole of the offending page or pages. It need hardly be said that the expurgators and excisors were often baptized Jews.

The Greeks had a popular phrase "to dispute on the shadow of an ass." The saying is said to have

originated in an anecdote which Demosthenes related to the Athenians. He was engaged in the defence of a man charged with a capital crime, and he noticed that those to whom he was addressing himself paid but little attention to his pleadings. He suddenly broke off in the midst of his argument and commenced to tell this story. "A traveller was once sent from Athens to Megara on a hired ass. It happened during the dog days, and at noon he was much exposed to the heat of the sun. Not finding as much as a bush under which to take shelter, he descended from the ass and seated himself in its shadow. The owner of the ass, who accompanied him, objected to this, asserting that when he let the animal, the use of its shadow was not included in the bargain. The dispute at last grew so warm that it got to blows, and finally gave rise to an action at law." After having said so much, Demosthenes continued the defence of his client; but the auditors, whose curiosity he had piqued, were anxious to learn how the judges had decided in so singular a cause. Upon this the orator commented severely. He rebuked their childish injustice in devouring with attention a paltry story about an ass's shadow, while they turned a deaf ear to a cause in which the life of a human being was involved.

From that day when a man showed preference for discussing small and contemptible subjects, rather than great and important ones, he was said "to dispute on the shadow of an ass."

It is to be feared that the dispute concerning the shadow of an ass is a perennial one. If one could take a comprehensive survey of the controversies that have inflamed individuals, families, parties, and states, it

would in all probability be found that the majority of them were, in their origin, of a very trivial nature. So at all events they generally appear to those who are not themselves involved in, and carried along by, the actual rush and current of the controversy. Now I do not say that it is invariably safe or true to test the importance of a dispute by the opinion formed of it by outsiders. But mostly the test is a just one. And if this be so, then the great bulk of party controversy stands branded as trivial.

This side of my subject has been so often treated that I need not linger over it now. How many men were done to death, "martyrs to a diphthong," as Boileau has it, in the controversy between the *homo-ousians* and the *homoi-ousians*, on which Gibbon waxes so merry. Then there was the celebrated dispute between the Jansenists and Jesuits as to sufficient and efficacious grace. The best results of this last puzzling dispute were Pascal's satires, sufficient and efficacious at once. All this class of controversy is exposed in masterly style by the prince of satirists, Jonathan Swift. In Lilliput, Gulliver finds a struggle raging as to the relative advantage of high and low heels on the shoes of officers of state. Still funnier is the cause of the obstinate war between Lilliput and Blefusca. It was the war of the Big-endians and the Little-endians; should the egg be broken at the big end or at the little end? These are satires on matters of Christian controversy. Are we quite sure that some of our own religious differences turn upon more important questions? Are we not also given to take words for things and to dispute over them, as if the heavens would fall unless each side had its own way?

We are all doughty fighters for trifles. Our passions are roused and our energies wasted in paltry squabbles, while the real issues of life and death are of indifference to us. Judah Leon Gordon made this defect of our character the subject of several of his Hebrew poems. The "tail of a Yod," published in 1876, is one of his most effective protests. The omission of the letter yod in the name Hillel invalidated a decree of divorce, and the result was life-long misery for the poet's heroine Bath-Shua. With the poet's licensed exaggeration of the facts, Gordon tilts again and again at the solemn trifling which makes of the infinitely little a mountain under whose weight a life may be crushed. The saving common sense of the Talmudic Rabbis would have made an end speedily enough to much of the casuistry of their present-day representatives.

I have heard the story of a Jewish ritual dispute which is quite on a level with that which we find so entertaining in Swift. A small Jewish congregation was being formed in a certain place, and the members were partly "Spanish," partly "German" Jews. They had come to a compromise about the ritual, but there was one point upon which agreement was found to be impossible. At the end of the Eighteen Benedictions (*Shemoneh Esreh*) there is, as you all know, a prayer for peace. The "Germans" have two formulæ—one beginning *Sîm shalom*, the other *Shalom rab ta-sîm*; the "Spaniards" use only the one formula, the first-named. Over the question whether it should be *sîm shalom* or *shalom rab ta-sîm*, "Grant peace" or "Peace grant," began the tug-of-war. Authorities were invoked, the Talmud, Rab Amram, Maimonides and others were appealed to. Neither side would give

way; the feud waxed hot and hotter; and the upshot of it all was that the congregation was broken up into two irreconcilable factions, on account of the question whether of an afternoon and evening the congregation was to pray "Grant peace" or "Peace grant"!

I do not speak thus to raise a laugh. I would ask you to take the moral seriously to heart. We cannot hope, nor need we wish, to agree on all things; such great controversies as are connected with Zionism and Biblical Criticism must for some time to come divide us. But we must not allow great controversies to be overshadowed by the small, nor must we allow controversies great or small to prevent us coming together in devout worship and praise of our common God, in steadfast allegiance to the common cause of Judaism, in energetic pursuit of the common good of the whole human race. While we wrangle, said Baxter, as to whether Jachin or Boaz is the more beautiful column, the Temple itself is deserted and falls into decay. Let us Jews try to pull together; let our union of hearts be one of the "curiosities of controversy"—the most notable, the most unexpected, the most difficult, but the most desirable of all its curiosities if it can be attained.

ISAAC HIRSCH WEISS

(*From the Jewish Chronicle, June* 16, 1905.)

At the patriarchal age of ninety, Isaac Hirsch Weiss, Lector of the Beth Hamidrash in Vienna, has been gathered to his fathers. He was a living link with a period in which the spirit of the Middle Ages seemed to linger. Thus in 1815, when Weiss was born, the law still limited the number of Jewish families that might be domiciled in the various towns of the Austrian Empire, and made the permission to marry a matter of privilege to be purchased from the State at a not inconsiderable cost. The state of affairs within the Jewish community reflected in many respects the depressing conditions without.

But no outward influences, however unfavourable, can prevail against the innate and indomitable Jewish passion for learning. The son of a respected merchant of Mezeritz, a town in Moravia, Isaac Hirsch Weiss was early initiated in all the Jewish learning within reach. He was something of an infant prodigy, whose precocious knowledge of the Talmud, however, called forth from the sensible Rabbi of Nikolsburg not approval, but remonstrance. He studied under the most eminent Rabbis of his time, spending many years successively at the Yeshiboth (rabbinical colleges) of Trebitsch,

L.A.

U

Eisenstaat and Nikolsburg. Among his contemporaries, men who had been students under the same masters as himself, were Leopold Dukes, the brilliant and versatile scholar whose twenty years' sojourn in England is still a cherished memory in Anglo-Jewry, and Leopold Löw, one of the greatest figures in Hungarian Jewry, who became the leader of progressive Judaism in his country.

To Weiss' pen Jewish scholarship is indebted for, among other important productions, " Orach Lazadik," a compendium of ritual laws ; an erudite edition of the Sifra ; *Beth Talmud*, a monthly Hebrew magazine and review, conducted in conjunction with Lector Friedmann ; a monograph on Rashi, and especially his great work in five volumes, " Dor Dor Vedorshav," in which he traces the history of Jewish Tradition from its beginnings in the scriptures to the time of the expulsion of the Jews from Spain. An article of his on " The Study of the Talmud in the Thirteenth Century " appeared in the first volume of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, and was subsequently embodied in the fifth volume of his " Jewish Tradition."

His industry throughout his long life was unremitting. In the morning he sowed his seed, and in the evening he suffered not his hand to be slack. There is no doubt that he has left large quantities of unpublished literary material. In his eighty-first year, at the suggestion of the late Dr. David Kaufmann, of Buda-Pesth, he wrote his Reminiscences (Zichronothai), in which he has many interesting things to tell of Jewish student life in the days of his youth, and passes in review the characters and opinions of many of the great ones in Israel of the last century, S. J. Rapoport, S. D. Luzzatto, Nachman Krochmal, I. S. Reggio, Zunz, Geiger, and others.

The Hebrew language, in which most of his works were composed, proved a marvellously flexible and expressive medium in his hands. His example has done not a little to foster the modern revival of the love of Hebrew. How Zunz estimated the achievements in this field of Weiss and of his colleague Friedmann may be seen from the following. Zunz had often been pressed, and had as often refused, to allow his "Gottesdienstliche Vorträge" to be translated into Hebrew. The work required revision, he said, and he was too old to undertake it. Ultimately, however, he expressed himself content that a Hebrew translation should be made, but the condition was that none but Weiss and Friedmann should have a hand in it.

In 1890 I had the privilege of spending, during a couple of months, the greater part of every day in his company. How often had I reason to marvel at his easy command of the whole field of rabbinical literature and learning! His enthusiasm for Jewish history and science was something to remember; it would have been well-nigh impossible for any one associating with him to escape the noble infection. In his method of teaching there was a grasp and a lucidity that made learning from him hour after hour a long-sustained delight. But, indeed, one was always learning from him, even during the lightest conversation. Most interesting it was to hear him speak of life in the old Yeshiboth of Hungary, Bohemia, and Moravia; of the efforts made by the new learning to invade the domains of the old; of the curious contrasts presented in the Yeshiboth, as elsewhere, of pettiness and greatness of soul; of the hardships and privations unmurmuringly borne by eager students of the Torah, and the generous rivalry among the more

fortunate members of the congregation in extending hospitality to the needy Bachur (as the youthful student is still lovingly termed).

A hard hitter in controversy when he felt himself in the right, Weiss never yielded to the temptation, from which even religious disputants are not free, to dip his pen in gall, or to cover with ridicule those who honestly gave utterance to views to which he could not assent. As he himself expressed it: "How dare I pour ridicule upon a man whose intent at least it was to benefit me?"

There was a strange personal fascination about the man, with his large, dark, piercing eyes, and a face furrowed with lines dug as much by sorrow as by age. The hand of fate had lain heavy upon him. He had suffered much worldly loss through trusting untrustworthy friends, and he never quite recovered from the blow by which he was deprived of two gifted sons in the prime of their life.

I saw Lector Weiss again when I was in Vienna in January of this year. The pathos of the scene has haunted me ever since. Though he had given me reason to believe that I held some little place in his conscious thought, he seemed now hardly able to recognize me. Some idea he was struggling after disturbed and distressed him. His strength had forsaken him; his light was dimmed; he was paying a heavy price for having lived fourscore years and ten. A son was giving him filial tendance, yet there was an air of desolation both without and within that made it hard to realize that this was the last phase in the life of a veteran who had fought so well and bravely in a seventy years' war for the Torah. There is a saying in the Talmud that

the fragments of the old and shattered tables of the Law were not cast away, but that equally with the new and unbroken ones they were given an honoured resting-place in the holy Ark. Is that legend meant for a lesson here, or for a promise hereafter?